

The Structure of IR Luminous Galaxies at 100 Microns

Eric C. Zink, Dan F. Lester, Greg Doppmann, Paul M. Harvey

Astronomy Department and McDonald Observatory, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712

ABSTRACT

We have observed twenty two galaxies at 100 μm with the Kuiper Airborne Observatory in order to determine the size of their FIR emitting regions. Most of these galaxies are luminous far-infrared sources, with $L_{\text{FIR}} > 10^{11} L_{\odot}$. This data constitutes the highest spatial resolution ever achieved on luminous galaxies in the far infrared. Our data includes direct measurements of the spatial structure of the sources, in which we look for departures from point source profiles. Additionally, comparison of our small beam 100 μm fluxes with the large beam IRAS fluxes shows how much flux falls beyond our detectors but within the IRAS beam. Several sources with point-like cores show evidence for such a net flux deficit. We clearly resolved six of these galaxies at 100 μm and have some evidence for extension in seven others. Those galaxies which we have resolved can have little of their 100 μm flux directly emitted by a point-like active galactic nucleus (AGN). Dust heated to ~ 40 K by recent bursts of non-nuclear star formation provides the best explanation for their extreme FIR luminosity. In a few cases, heating of an extended region by a compact central source is also a plausible option. Assuming the FIR emission we see is from dust, we also use the sizes we derive to find the dust temperatures and optical depths at 100 μm which we translate into an effective visual extinction through the galaxy. Our work shows that studies of the far infrared structure of luminous infrared galaxies is clearly within the capabilities of new generation far infrared instrumentation, such as SOFIA and SIRTf.

Subject headings: galaxies, infrared

1. Introduction

Data from the Kuiper Airborne Observatory, and later the Infra-Red Astronomical Satellite (IRAS) revealed that many galaxies emit much more flux in the far-infrared (FIR, $\sim 40 - 120 \mu\text{m}$) than in any other wavelength band (Telesco and Harper 1980; Houck et al. 1984; Soifer et al. 1984; de Jong et al. 1984). This FIR is usually attributed to thermal emission from warm (~ 40 K) dust heated by starbursts (Elston, Cornell, & Lebofsky 1985; Lawrence et al. 1986). There may also be a direct nonthermal contribution to the FIR luminosity from an active galactic nucleus (AGN), but at least the energy distributions suggest that emission from warm dust grains likely dominates the FIR flux even if there is an obvious active core and the galaxy is not obviously dusty (Barvainis, Antonucci, & Coleman 1992; Chini 1992; Soifer, Houck, & Neugebauer 1987; Edelson & Malkan 1987).

While the most likely scenario for the FIR emission in galaxies is dust absorbing strong radiation from a burst of young massive stars, other scenarios are possible. Extended dust could also be heated directly by an AGN core. In addition, the dust could be reprocessing less energetic photons from an older population of stars in the galaxy, an energy source that is known to dominate in relatively low luminosity quiescent systems. It has been suggested that the dust could be heated by hot (10^8 K) intergalactic gas (Dwek & Arendt 1992; Bregman, McNamara, & O'Connell 1990), but this would only happen when such hot gas exists in the vicinity, as in the center of a large cluster of galaxies. Dust could also be heated by shocks in the interstellar medium during the collision or interaction of galaxies (Harwit et al. 1987).

Each of the dust heating mechanisms above should correspond to particular spatial distributions of FIR light. If the FIR emission is from the active core itself, the flux should appear point-like. If it is from dust heated by an active nucleus, we might expect color temperature gradients to point toward the nucleus. Starburst heated dust should have about the same scale size as the burst itself because the young stars are well mixed with the gas from which the stars are forming and the optical depth for their UV photons is very high in the interstellar medium. On the other hand, dust heated by nonionizing photons from a cooler population of stars that expel condensables might be expected to follow the smooth distribution of older stars in the galaxy. It is well understood that

evidence for interactions, collisions, and mergers is almost invariably associated with the most luminous infrared galaxies, and comparison of the far infrared luminosity distribution with that of the interaction geometry is a vital clue to the mechanism by which this energy is produced.

The question that motivated this observational project was a straightforward one. Does the far infrared emission in luminous galaxies, representing the bulk of the emitted energy, show any evidence for spatial structure using the highest spatial resolutions that are available to us? The distribution of luminosity in these sources can be a key to understanding their energy production mechanisms. Our observations address this question, and we develop relevant observational strategies for future high resolution studies. An associated question is whether we can use these measurements to help distinguish between the various plausible heating mechanisms.

High spatial resolution observations in the far infrared are seriously handicapped compared with observations in most other spectral regions. This part of the spectrum, containing the peak of energy emission from luminous galaxies, is inaccessible from the ground, and the spatial resolution that can be achieved is completely diffraction limited. A large aperture above the terrestrial water vapor absorption is a necessary tool. While large ground-based telescopes can attack the problem on arcsecond scales using tracers of hot and cool dust in the mid-IR and submillimeter continuum respectively, the correspondence of this dust with the distribution of warm dust that dominates the energy budget of luminous galaxies is not completely understood. To date, the largest telescopes that routinely observe in this spectral region are airborne and balloon-borne facilities.

While its high sensitivity allowed it to catalog many sources, IRAS resolved only the largest and nearest galaxies because of its comparatively large beam size of $\sim 2-4$ arcmin at 60 and $100 \mu\text{m}$. Deconvolution efforts improved on this resolution somewhat, but could not approach the ~ 23 arcsec diffraction-limited beam of the KAO. While ISO too has made fine contributions to the study of luminous galaxies, the higher S/N ratios that could be achieved in the far infrared continuum with ISOPHOT could not offset the substantially larger diffraction-limited beam size of that telescope, for example the ~ 43 arcsec pixel size of the C100 channel.

We observed the spatial structure of a sample of

luminous galaxies with the Kuiper Airborne Observatory at 100 μm . These observations were among the last made during the long mission of this highly successful platform, which concluded in 1996. With its 0.9m aperture, the KAO allowed the highest possible diffraction-limited resolution at this wavelength. This work is likely to be the highest spatial resolution study available near the peak of the energy emission from these galaxies until the commissioning of SOFIA and SIRTf.

Determination of the distribution of far infrared emission in luminous galaxies enables several phenomenological and astrophysical insights into these objects. Many of these galaxies are interacting systems, and little direct information is available about precisely where in these multiple objects the luminosity actually originates. Such information would greatly illuminate the mechanism by which galactic collisions produce these luminous sources. The scale size over which the warm dust is distributed allows, through a simple, single-slab model calculation, the optical depth of the emitting dust. This information is of interest in our understanding of the global structure of these sources, and the extent to which higher spatial resolution information at shorter, more extinction-dependent wavelengths can be trusted to give an accurate picture. This analysis also allows independent estimation of the grain temperatures from the spectral color temperatures, which can be significantly different in sources with substantial optical depth.

In Section 2 we will discuss the sample of galaxies that we observed. Section 3 will cover details about the observations and Section 4 will describe the analysis methodology. Section 5 presents the general results from our study, along with a discussion for each galaxy. Further discussion of our results follows in Section 6.

2. The Sample

Our sample consisted of 22 galaxies with IRAS 100 μm fluxes greater than or equal to 8 Jy. Their targeting coordinates and the dates on which we observed them are listed in Table 1. We used the peak radio position of each galaxy for targeting because radio positions are more accurately known than the optical or FIR positions and are likely to correspond closely to the FIR peak (Bica & Helou 1990). All of the galaxies except NGC 4151 (see also below) and UGC 10923

are part of the Revised Bright Galaxy Sample (BGS) (Soifer et al. 1989) or the Bright Galaxy Survey - Part II (BGS2) (Sanders et al. 1995).

The vagaries of airborne astronomy flight planning led to a somewhat inhomogeneous mix of objects. In general we attempted to observe the brightest sources possible and so we have a wide range of luminosities, but our observations were intentionally biased towards the highest. All of our sources except NGC 4151 and NGC 7625 have $L_{\text{FIR}} > 10^{10} L_{\odot}$ and 14 have a $L_{\text{FIR}} > 10^{11} L_{\odot}$. Physical characteristics of the sample galaxies are listed in Table 2. NGC 4151 is by far the least luminous galaxy we observed with a $\log(L_{\text{FIR}}/L_{\odot}) = 9.5$ and was included in our sample specifically to confirm an earlier detection of extended emission (Engargiola et al. 1988; Gaffney et al. 1992). As it turns out, it provides an excellent contrasting case to the others.

An additional selection constraint came from our attempt to select galaxies with relatively bright guide stars nearby. This was required because because the galaxy core was rarely bright enough to lock onto with the KAO optical guider. Because of this selection criterion, most of the galaxies are within $7'$ of an object with a magnitude $V < 12$ as listed in the Hubble Telescope Guide Star Catalog (GSC). However the GSC does not list only stars, and several of the objects which we had planned to use as guide stars turned out to be brighter galaxies themselves. So by preferentially choosing galaxies with nearby bright GSC objects, 16 of our 22 galaxies turned out to have obvious nearby companion galaxies. The ratio of FIR luminous galaxies with companions to those without, in an unbiased sample, is between 1/4 and 1/8 (Soifer et al. 1984) so even for our luminous galaxy sample, our ratio of $> 2/3$ implies a significant bias towards galaxies with companions.

Other subtleties of airborne astronomy had a strong influence on the particular galaxies used in our sample but not their characteristics (aside from the bias noted above). The telescope in the airplane is essentially immobile in the azimuth direction so pointing in azimuth is accomplished by flying the airplane in the proper direction. The azimuth of the object being observed thus determines the direction of flight. The challenge of piecing together observing legs on relevant objects (such that one can eventually return to home base), and the need to observe the largest number of objects determined the time and azimuth at which each object was observed. Since the instru-

ment was not equipped with an image rotator, the position angle of our linear array across each galaxy was not independently selectable, and the array remained oriented approximately in elevation. For sources in which a particular position angle was strongly preferred, this position angle became a flight planning constraint that sometimes could be achieved by observing at the right parallactic angle.

3. Observations

We observed all galaxies and calibration sources with the 0.9 m Kuiper Airborne Observatory (KAO) flying from Moffett Field, CA. Data presented in this paper is from flights on January 6, August 12, and August 16 in 1994 and on August 26 and 29 in 1995. We used the University of Texas 2×10^3 He cooled silicon bolometer array with a filter centered near $100 \mu\text{m}$. See Harvey 1979) for details of the “100 μm narrow” filter responsivity for this instrument.

The detectors in the 2×10 spatial array are rectangular in shape with the short sides of the detectors aligned along the long axis of the array. The long dimension of each detector corresponds approximately to the size of the diffraction spot of the KAO at $100 \mu\text{m}$ ($\lambda/D \sim 23''$). The short dimension of each detector is half as large and thus critically samples the diffraction spot. The detectors have center to center separation of $13.8''$ along the long axis of the array and $28''$ between the two arms (See Figure 1) giving relatively little dead space between elements.

We observed in the nodding mode, alternating the position of the source between the two beams created by the $\sim 4'$ azimuth chop (along the short axis of the array). In this mode a point source has a Gaussian FWHM of about $30''$ along the long axis of the array. We scanned the detectors systematically over bright point sources during each flight series in order to determine individual detector responsivities for flat fielding. These detector-to-detector responsivity ratios vary by about 5% for different point sources on the same flight (Smith et al. 1994) and by a similar amount for point sources between flights during the same flight series. This is far less than the photometric errors from other parts of our calibration (see Section 4.1).

We targeted the telescope so that the peak of the FIR emission, which we presumed to correspond to the radio positions in Table 1, was on the center of the middle detector on one of the arms of the ar-

ray (detector 5, see Figure 1 for definition of detector numbers and coordinates). Only for NGC 4151 was the visual core bright enough that we could guide directly on it using the KAO focal plane video camera.

The second arm of the array (detectors 11-20) was of lower quality, with several non-functional elements and others with high noise. As a result, we centered the source on the first arm (1-10) and used data from this second arm mostly as a check on positioning. The data from this second arm of the detector array is not presented here, though we show the locations of that second arm in the Figures to show the auxiliary information that was available to us.

Since it was usually not possible to guide on the galaxy itself we guided on a nearby offset star. On telescopes with an altitude-azimuth mount such as the KAO, the field of view rotates while tracking. When offset guiding, this means the FIR source will appear to revolve around the guide star. Only by knowing the field rotation can we accurately target the array at the FIR source. This angle is only known to $\sim 0.3^\circ$ on the KAO because of the limited resolution of the telescope stabilization system. So the best pointing is achieved by using guide stars that are close to the galaxy, where the uncertainty in the field rotation will result in the smallest possible offset from the galaxy to the array center. We consistently used guide stars $< 10'$ away from the galaxy so the resulting tracking error was $< 3''$. This is a small fraction of the size of our pixels. The guide star positions were taken from the GSC, which can be assumed to be reliable at this level or better.

On the 16 August 1994 flight as well as the 1995 flights we either poorly defined the $100 \mu\text{m}$ boresight on the array or the boresight drifted during the flight. The result of the poor boresight is that the center of the peaks shifted from the center of detector 5 by as much as $7''$. The effects of the shift and how we dealt with them will be discussed in Section 4.1.

4. Data Reduction

The images in Figures 2 - 23 show the detector array projected on the digitized Palomar Observatory Sky Survey (DSS) image with detector 5 centered at the position for each galaxy given in Table 1 (our target position), rotated to the average position angle at which we observed. The range of the position angles over which the array moved during the time of observation is listed in Table 1, but for simplicity we do

not show this on the figures. The change in position angles was usually fairly small, but in some cases was as much as 20° over the course of our observation. Since the effect of this field rotation is to rotate the array around the target center, the outermost detectors (1 and 10) could have been, at times, as far as $12''$ from the positions shown in the Figures. Usually the position angle changed by far less and in some cases we used the KAO “freeze mode” which rotated the whole telescope at the same rate as the sky rotated so that the range in position angle was limited only by the telescope rotation stability (about 0.3°). This was only possible for tracks in which the field rotated by less than the ± 2 degree dynamic range of the telescope line-of-sight axis.

4.1. Flux Calibration

Careful flux calibration might not seem necessary in view of the fact that we are mainly trying to determine the angular size and shape of the object. Nevertheless, good determinations of the emission of the galaxy in our relatively small beam combined with the larger beam observations from IRAS provide us with an additional test for spatial extension. If we get less signal in our peak detector than a point source with the cataloged IRAS flux should produce, we could interpret the deficit as evidence for extension on a scale of our detector size.

In order to make these comparisons worthwhile, we must make sure that our flux determinations are firmly on the IRAS photometric system. The IRAS $100\ \mu\text{m}$ primary standards were, however, all substantially resolved in our small beam, making them difficult to use as point-source comparisons. Therefore, we developed a secondary system of standards using asteroids, which are point-like for both instruments. The utility of such a system of standards has been recognized for ISOPHOT calibration (e.g. Muller et al. 1998).

In summary, this calibration effort involved using the radiometric constants derived from the IRAS Asteroid Survey (which give identically the IRAS fluxes for the relevant orbital geometry at the IRAS observation epoch), and used these radiometric constants to calculate their brightness at the particular epoch of our observations. The asteroids are thus used as roving standards, where the thermophysical characteristics are taken as the calibration constants, and the predicted flux densities vary in a predictable way with the distances to the Sun and to the Earth.

Our choice of asteroids was constrained by those that were bright enough to give a high signal-to-noise detection, and those that were targetable in terms of the flight planning constraints detailed above. In addition, we rejected asteroids from our sample that were known to show more than ten percent optical variability which, whether because of albedo variations or non-sphericity might cause similar variations and predictive uncertainties at $100\ \mu\text{m}$.

We calculated temperatures and fluxes of these asteroids with a simple thermal model (Lebofsky et al. 1986). The model assumes: (1) spherical shapes so that the flux does not vary with rotation, (2) slow rates of rotation, so that the dark side of the asteroid has time to cool down completely and only the sunlit side radiates in the IR, (3) albedos that are uniform and equal to those used in the IRAS Asteroid Survey, (4) sizes from the IRAS asteroid survey, and (5) thermal equilibrium for all points on the asteroid. We estimate an error of 10% for the asteroid fluxes calculated with this model. Deriving the system responsivities from the observed signal corrected for our filter response and the calculated asteroid fluxes puts us on the IRAS photometric system and allows comparisons between our fluxes and the fluxes from IRAS.

On 6 January 1994 we observed 1 Ceres, 52 Europa, and 97 Klotho in order to calibrate the galaxy fluxes. We failed to observe an asteroid on 12 August 1994 and had to use the observation of 2 Pallas performed on 16 August to calibrate. We believe the system responsivity was stable enough that this did not add significantly to the errors because we note the same signal strength on each night for those galaxies we observed on both nights. We also found that for NGC 7541 which we only observed on 12 August, the flux we calculate matches the IRAS flux. We calibrated with 704 Interamnia and 56 Melete on the 26 August 1995 flight, and with 704 Interamnia and 386 Siegena on the 29 August 1995 flight.

In addition to asteroids, we observed IRC+10420 as a point source calibrator and to define our bore-sight. We cannot use IRC+10420 for photometry calibration because it seems to vary at $100\ \mu\text{m}$ from as low as $177 \pm 30\ \text{Jy}$ to as high as $360 \pm 108\ \text{Jy}$ (Harvey 1991) and in the optical and near infrared as well (Jones et al. 1993). We also could not compare our observations of this object made on the flights of 12 and 16 August to make up for the lack of a calibrating asteroid observation on the 12 August flight. A problem with the secondary chopping mirror which

started after we observed IRC+10420 on 12 August and before we observed any galaxies changed the system sensitivity and prevents any simple comparison of IRC+10420 signals from the two nights. The same chopping problem existed on the entire 16 August flight.

A one dimensional FIR profile was obtained for each galaxy and calibrator source by plotting the signal in each of the detectors 1-10. These plots are shown in Figures 2 - 23. To these profiles we fit a baseline to the end detectors. The baseline was usually the best fit line through detectors 1, 2, 9, and 10. While the baseline allowed us to subtract small offsets that are the residual from chopping and nodding, that subtraction makes the derived fluxes entirely insensitive to emission on scales greater than $\sim 100''$ in the direction along the long axis of the array. Optical images of each galaxy suggest that there is not likely to be a great deal of emission on scales larger than $100''$ scales unless the galaxy is very close. The small/large beam flux comparison provides a check on this assumption.

For each asteroid, we then added up the contributions from detectors 1-10, divided by the calculated flux of the asteroids, and divided the result by a factor 0.96 (which corrects our filter response to that of the IRAS bandpass) to get the system responsivity (signal per IRAS unit Jansky) at $100\ \mu\text{m}$ for detectors 1-10. We did the same for the signal observed only in detector 5 to derive a measurement with a smaller effective aperture. See Table 3 for the actual signal levels (in DN) and responsivities for each of the asteroids. For flights with more than one asteroid observation we use the average responsivity derived from all asteroids observed. Our signal errors for the asteroids include not only errors due to noise from each of the detectors but also error associated with the uncertainty of the placement of the baseline. These errors contribute approximately equally to the total error quoted.

Because of the stability of the system from flight to flight we might have expected the total system responsivities shown in the last 2 columns of Table 3 to be the same. The varying responsivities listed for the various flights differ because of changes in the system configuration between the flights and in particular the chopping problem experienced in 1995 August.

The profile of some asteroids and galaxies were not exactly centered in detector 5 of the detector array due to boresight shifts. In order to compensate for

such small pointing errors, we fit a Gaussian profile to each of the high S/N point source profiles of IRC+10420 obtained on the August flights and to the point-like 1 Ceres profile for the January 1994 flight. We calculated the shift along the array needed to fit the point source Gaussian (with the same signal in detectors 1-10 as the galaxy or asteroid profile) to the two detectors in each source profile with the highest signal (usually detectors 4 and 5). Since most sources had profiles that differed only slightly from that of a point source, the fit told us how far the center of the diffraction spot was from detector 5 along the long axis of the array as well as the signal that each detector should have had if the source had been perfectly centered.

We calculate the galaxy flux density by taking the signal from the galaxy, multiplying by the responsivity from the asteroids. We then corrected for the response of the galaxy to the filter by dividing the result by a factor 0.87. This is a different factor than for the asteroids because of the much cooler spectral shape of the galaxies. Fluxes for the galaxies calculated from the signal in the central detector 5 only, corrected for any mispointing, are shown in the first column of Table 4. The detector 5 flux is simply the signal from that detector translated into the equivalent flux of a point source centered on detector 5. The detector 5 flux should always be less than or equal to that summed across the whole array (detectors 1-10, also shown), but errors (mostly in baseline removal) allow some galaxies in Table 4 to have center detector fluxes slightly larger than their summed flux. As noted above, the errors for all fluxes include not only error associated with the individual detectors but also include some attempt to estimate the error associated with removing the baselines. Error from the asteroid calibration (assumed to be 10%) is also included in the errors quoted. Our error estimates do not include small additional contributions from stratospheric opacity variations, filter corrections, pointing errors. It can be seen from the point source profiles in Figure 2 that the errors in offset guiding targeting discussed above should have only a minor effect on the signal that was measured. The effect of pointing errors on the measured source profile is discussed in more detail below.

In spite of the many steps and possible pitfalls in this calibration, it is gratifying that the measured galaxy fluxes never exceed the IRAS fluxes, which is consistent with a calibration of high accuracy.

Our observed small-beam fluxes are compared to the large-beam IRAS fluxes of these galaxies at $100\ \mu\text{m}$ in the BGS (Soifer et al. 1989) and the BGS2 (Sanders et al. 1995). For dust at 30-50 K with emissivity exponent $n = 1-2$, color correction changes the IRAS fluxes at $100\ \mu\text{m}$ by only about 5%. This is insignificant compared to the much larger errors ($\sim 15-20\%$) of our calibration, so we do not correct the IRAS fluxes for color in Table 4 or anywhere in this paper. NGC 4151 and UGC 10923 are not in the BGS or the BGS2. The NGC 4151 flux is from Edelson, Malkan and Rieke (1987) and the UGC 10923 flux is from Mazzarella et al. 1991) In general there is excellent agreement between our observed and the (non-color corrected) IRAS fluxes.

4.2. Resolution

To determine if we resolved the galaxy or not, we compare the profile from detectors 1-10 with the point source profile (PSP). We define the profile of IRC+10420 as the PSP on those flights where that bright source was observed. For the 1994 January observations we used the profile of the high S/N asteroid 1 Ceres as our PSP. Note that while the fainter asteroids gave adequate S/N for flux calibration, IRC+10420 and Ceres profiles were most useful for generating accurate point source profiles.

If the galaxy is strongly emitting on scales greater than $20''$, its profile will be noticeably more extended than the PSP. In the upper parts of Figures 2- 23 the profile of each galaxy we observed is compared to the PSP in two ways. One PSP is scaled and shifted so that it is normalized to the peak signal of the galaxy (dashed lines), usually in detector 5. The dotted lines are point sources with the IRAS flux shifted to the same offset as that of the Gaussian curve fit through the five central detectors in the profile. These latter dotted lines are what a point source with the IRAS $100\ \mu\text{m}$ flux would have looked like if it were centered on our array in the same way as the galaxy.

The width of the best fit Gaussian gives the first estimate of the size of the FIR emitting region. If we assume the galaxy profile is intrinsically Gaussian then deconvolution is trivial, ($\text{FWHM}_{\text{observed}}^2 = \text{FWHM}_{\text{source}}^2 + \text{FWHM}_{\text{PSP}}^2$), and allows us to determine the Gaussian size of the source, $D_g = \text{FWHM}_{\text{source}}$. In addition, we used a model of the galaxy disks such that $I = I_o \exp(-r/r_o)$ with a total flux equal to the flux we found from the sum of detectors 1-10. We then found the best fit r_o by a two

dimensional convolution of the model with the two dimensional PSP (with a width of $\sim 40''$ in x). The exponential disk size D_e is then simply $2 \times r_o$. The results of the fits to the profiles, D_g and D_e are given in Table 5.

If the profile does not show clear evidence for extended FIR emission by comparison with the shape of the PSP, then the photometry may reveal more subtle evidence for extension. The IRAS beam is $\sim 2 \times 4''$ at $100\ \mu\text{m}$. Our “beam” for a single detector is $\sim 36''$ FWHM if we factor in the larger point source spread in the direction perpendicular to the long axis of the array. Our “beam” for the entire array is $\sim 40'' \times 100''$. If the flux we detect is smaller than the IRAS flux, and the source has not varied in brightness since the IRAS observations, we can argue that the spatial distribution of the FIR is extended such that some of the flux is outside of our beam but inside the IRAS beam. Assuming the same exponential disk model mentioned above, we solved for r_o for each galaxy using the detected flux from detector 5 and the IRAS flux. These values are also included on Table 5.

The sizes quoted in Table 5 can be considered significant only for those galaxies which show extension with respect to the point source profiles in Figures 2-23. Most of the galaxies with $D_g < 20''$ in Table 5 are indistinguishable from point sources and so the values given in Table 5 represent an upper limit to the size from our modeling. Those galaxies with $D_g > 20''$ in Table 5 are convincingly extended with respect to the point source profiles, and the sizes quoted represent the actual size of the galaxy at $100\ \mu\text{m}$.

The pointing errors mentioned in Sections 3 and 4.1 would tend to make the galaxy profiles larger than they actually are because while we can directly guide on the optical images of the calibrating objects and assure that the position of the array does not change relative to them, we offset guide on most of the galaxies and thus have less assurance that the array did not shift significantly over the course of the observation. Assuming we observed for half the time with the FIR core centered on detector 5 and half the time centered between detectors 4 and 5 ($\sim 7''$ away; matching the displacement of the calibrating asteroid observed at the end of the 16 August flight) the sizes we estimate in Table 5 for a galaxy with a $D_g \sim 20''$ are only 10% larger than they would be if the pointing were perfect. The sizes for the galaxies with $D_e \sim 12''$ are also only 10% too large if we assume the diffraction spot moved with respect to the detector array. For

galaxy FWHM smaller than $D_g \sim 20''$ in the Gaussian model or $D_e \sim 12''$ in the exponential disk model, the errors due to possible mispointing are larger but we do not consider them resolved, in any case.

The widths of the point source profiles obtained on different flights and different flight series are the same to within 5%. These errors are dominated by tracking errors. Assuming that the galaxy profiles have the same error in widths, standard propagation of errors means the values with Gaussian sizes of $\sim 20''$ given in Table 5 are good to within $\sim 15\%$, not including the possible systematic error of up to 10% due to mispointing. For both the random error and the possible systematic error (due to pointing problems) the percentage of error in the quoted widths decreases with greater size, so those galaxies with Gaussian sizes much greater than $20''$ have more accurate sizes than those for the less extended galaxies.

5. Results

5.1. Derived Characteristics

5.1.1. Temperatures, Optical Depths, and Emissivity Exponents

For a single uniform slab of dust, the flux observed at a particular wavelength λ is

$$S_\lambda = B_\lambda(T_d)Q_\lambda\Omega_\lambda \quad (1)$$

where $B_\lambda(T_d)$ is the Planck function at the dust temperature T_d , Q_λ is the dust emissivity at λ , and Ω_λ is the apparent size of the slab. Equation 1 is often used to derive a “dust temperature” from the 60 and 100 μm IRAS FIR fluxes by assuming (1) the galaxy contains only a single slab of dust with a single temperature, (2) τ_λ is very small at FIR wavelengths so that $Q_\lambda \propto [1 - e^{-\tau_\lambda}]$ reduces to $Q_\lambda \propto \tau_\lambda$, and (3) $\tau_\lambda \propto \lambda^{-n}$ where n is the emissivity usually given a value 1-2. Condition (1) above implies among other things that $\Omega_{60} = \Omega_{100}$ and conditions (2) and (3) give $Q_{60}/Q_{100} = (60/100)^{-n}$ so that with S_{60}/S_{100} , one can solve for T_d .

Clearly this method has its shortcomings. Dust does not congregate in simple slabs at single temperatures and the temperature one calculates depends on the assumed value for. In addition, colder dust emitting primarily at wavelengths longer than 100 μm will not be detected. Thus the temperature given by this single slab method cannot even be realistically classified as an average or median dust temperature but

perhaps only as a typical temperature for the warm dust in the system.

Despite the shortcomings of the simple slab method, we use it to estimate dust temperature retaining assumptions (1) and (3). The typically 2-3 points of FIR data available for each galaxy are not enough to support models of greater complexity, such as models with several slabs at different temperatures. Infrared Space Observatory (ISO) broad band observations of NGC 6090 (Acosta-Pulido 1996) show that both hotter and colder dust exists. However, the 60 and 100 μm points still accurately model the dominant 20-50 K dust feature in both Seyfert (Rodríguez Espinosa et al. 1996) and starburst galaxies.

In this analysis, we use the IRAS fluxes at both 60 and 100 μm because we did not measure at 60 μm and the large beam IRAS fluxes are more likely to be spatially consistent with each other. As will be discussed below, occasionally our 100 μm flux is significantly different from the IRAS flux, usually because our smaller beam is pointed at only one of a cluster of galaxies which were all in the IRAS beam. In these cases we use our 100 μm flux with a 60 μm flux scaled so that our 60/100 ratio matches that of the IRAS fluxes. In this way, the T_d we generate is always close to the T_d that the IRAS fluxes would give without any further information. It is also important to note that by using data from both our 100 μm observations and IRAS fluxes from an epoch about 10 years earlier, we are assuming that the FIR fluxes of the galaxies we observed were constant from the IRAS epoch to that of our observation.

Our high spatial resolution data add the advantage of defining Ω_{100} and, by assumption (1) above, Ω_λ for the other wavelengths for which we have data. The spatial information allows us to calculate τ_{100} at the same time we as we derive T_d , but with a few notable exceptions of high optical depth, the T_d as calculated by our simple model is insensitive to the dust region size.

For Table 6, we define the angular size of a dust emission region in a galaxy, Ω_{100} , as the size of a circle with the diameter of the galaxy size as defined or limited by D_e . We use the scale length fit to the profile instead of the scale length derived from the flux in detector 5 and the IRAS flux because it not only more accurately measures the size of the core (and only the core) but also uses the information from many detectors instead of just one. For Table 7 we use D_g for those galaxies which we were able to resolve.

We assume an emissivity exponent $n = 1.5$ for Tables 6 and 7.

For those galaxies with measurements at longer wavelengths in the literature, we use the extra fluxes to derive n along with the derived dust temperature and the optical depth at $100\ \mu\text{m}$. The results are in Table 8; note that the value of n varies from 1.5 to greater than 2.2, but most estimates remain close to a typical galactic value of $n = 1.5$.

Having derived the optical depth, and assuming the dust is similar to dust in the solar neighborhood, we can use observed dust properties to estimate the visual extinction A_V . We assume a value of ~ 750 for A_V/τ_{100} (Makinen et al. 1985). This extinction may be particularly important when we attempt, for example, to use the sizes of $\text{H}\alpha$ regions to estimate the size of the central starburst. A high A_V value implies that the $\text{H}\alpha$ size may be unreliable. The calculated values of A_V we used and what they imply for each galaxy are included in Section 5.2. They were taken from (in order of preference) Tables 8, 6, and 7.

It is important to note that the single slab method we use to determine A_V is incapable of dealing with more complicated material distributions, and so it is risky to assume that our derived A_V applies uniformly over the central emitting region of a galaxy. It is much safer to use it to roughly estimate the amount of visual extinction from a FIR emitting region.

5.1.2. The q -value

The high resolution observations allow us to determine more accurately how much FIR flux is coming from galaxies and galaxy systems that were unresolved by IRAS. For galaxy pairs this allows a determination of the q -value (the ratio of FIR to radio flux) for each galaxy in the pair instead of for the system as a whole. For isolated galaxies it may allow the determination of this q -value for the central regions of the galaxy, independent of its outer regions.

The q -value is of interest because it is very nearly constant for a wide variety of galaxies with luminosities between 10^9 and $10^{13}L_\odot$ (Condon et al. 1991a, hereafter CHYT). This constancy is remarkable because of the completely different mechanisms by which the FIR and radio emission is produced. One way to reconcile this is through star formation where new stars heat dust to cause the FIR radiation and produce supernovae which generate the nonthermal radio emission (Condon et al. 1991a), though the

time scales of the energy production is quite different in these two cases.

The q -value is defined (Helou, Soifer, & Rowan-Robinson 1985) by

$$q \equiv \log[(FIR/3.75 \times 10^{12}\text{Hz})/S_{1.4\text{GHz}}] \quad (2)$$

where $S_{1.4\text{GHz}}$ is in $\text{W m}^{-2} \text{Hz}^{-1}$ and

$$FIR \equiv 1.26 \times 10^{-14}(2.58S_{60} + S_{100}) \quad (3)$$

is the estimated flux from $42.5 - 122.5\ \mu\text{m}$ (in W m^{-2}) if S_{60} and S_{100} are IRAS survey measurements in Jy uncorrected for color (Helou et al. 1988). These are listed in Table 2, and discussed individually in the sections below in which the new information about the far infrared morphology bears on it.

The better determination of q for an individual galaxy in a pair could help explain the source of an anomalous q -value for that galaxy pair. For example in UGC 12914/5 (see Section 5.2.21 a “radio bridge” between the pair lowers the system q -value, but we show the q for the FIR dominant UGC 12915 is normal.

Our new calculations of the q -value might also help determine if the most luminous IR galaxies, and OH megamasers galaxies in particular, have an IR excess that gives a higher q -value. (Martin et al. 1989). We observed four OH megamaser galaxies and, when using the IRAS fluxes, the q -value is too high in three of them (III Zw 35, IRAS 1720-00, and Zw 475.056). Using our fluxes however, the q -value is too high in III Zw 35 and Zw 475.056 and in fact is low for UGC 08696. Of course, a sample of four does not decide the issue, but we find little evidence for high q -values in OH megamaser galaxies.

5.2. Discussion of Individual Galaxies

5.2.1. MCG+02-04-025

MCG+02-04-025 (IRAS 01173+1405) is a spiral with an optical extension of about $18'' \times 30''$ (Mirabel & Sanders 1988). In the DSS image there is a hint of a bridge of material between the galaxy and a fainter galaxy only $\sim 1'$ to the east (Figure 2). The interaction between the galaxies might be responsible for the $\log(L_{FIR}/L_\odot) = 11.27$. Mirabel & Sanders (1988) also note that the H I line profile is not the “horned” double peak of a normal spiral but is a single peak more common to galaxies that have suffered some interaction. They detected MCG+02-04-025 in H I

in both emission and absorption. From their detection they deduce an atomic gas mass greater than $3.4 \times 10^9 M_\odot$, most of which must be concentrated near the core in order to provide a sufficient optical depth to explain the absorption. Our observations show this galaxy to be marginally resolved at $100 \mu\text{m}$ (Figure 2), with a $D_g = 19.5''$ and a $D_e = 11''$. The galaxy profile is slightly larger than the PSP, but better evidence comes from the photometry. We do not recover the entire IRAS flux using the sum of detectors 1-10, and our detectors 11-20 show little evidence for any emission. This leaves the other side of the detector 1-10 arm of the array (to the southeast) as the place that may have the missing IRAS flux.

Using the flux from the center detector 5, the exponential disk model fit to our data gives an $r_o \sim 6.5''$ when compared to the larger IRAS beam measurement. This is close to but larger than the $r_o \sim 5''$ derived using the same exponential disk model with multibeam photometry at K (Carico et al. 1990b). Using the size of $2xr_o = 11''$, our $100 \mu\text{m}$ flux, and a $60 \mu\text{m}$ flux scaled so that the S_{60}/S_{100} ratio is the same as the Soifer et al. 1989 fluxes, we derive a $T_d = 44.6$ and $\tau_{100} = 2.1 \times 10^{-3}$ from which we get an $A_V \sim 1.6$. The A_V we derive from the FIR fluxes and size is low considering the large gas column density implied by Mirabel & Sanders (1988).

The possible extension at FIR wavelengths is interesting when compared to the radio morphology. The estimated size of the emission region depends on the size of the interferometric array. With a synthesized $6''$ beam (1.49 GHz, CHSS) find a Gaussian size $2'' \times 2''$. With a smaller $0.25''$ beam (8.44 GHz, CHYT) the size is only $1.2'' \times 0.8''$. Also, VLBI studies found an extremely compact core with emission on 5, 10, and 50 milliarcsecond scales (Lonsdale et al. 1993; Smith, Lonsdale, & Lonsdale 1998).

The radio studies argue quite convincingly that there is a compact radio core which might even be small enough that it becomes difficult to explain the luminosity with a starburst and its supernovae (Smith, Lonsdale, & Lonsdale 1998). However, the fact that in each case the radio emission was resolved, along with the possible extension in the FIR, argue that while a central luminous radio core may exist (weak AGN or starburst), much of the FIR flux originates on larger spatial scales. If one assumes that the FIR flux is due to dust heated by a central compact source, a simple spherically symmetric dust model (Barvainis 1987) suggests that this dust might have a

size $\sim 19''$. This size assumes that the luminosity of the central source in the UV matches the FIR luminosity and the dust at $T_d = 45$ has a clear view of the core. Thus, for this object, we conclude that while the far infrared emission is likely to be emitted in distributed sources, but that the situation energetically allows those sources to be heated by a central source, whether AGN or compact starburst.

5.2.2. III Zw 35

III Zw 35 is a close pair in visible light with components to the northeast and southwest separated by about $10''$ (Figure 3). The brighter northern component contains an active core (Seyfert 2), an OH megamaser (Diamond et al. 1999; Trotter et al. 1997), and is also the likely source for the formaldehyde (H_2CO) maser emission seen from the system (Baan, Haschick, & Uglesich 1993).

We do not resolve III Zw 35 at $100 \mu\text{m}$ (Figure 3) and our observed flux is almost identical to the IRAS flux. Using the BGS fluxes and the upper limit of the diameter of the emitting region of $12''$, we obtain a dust temperature of ~ 40 K and an optical depth at $100 \mu\text{m}$ $\tau_{100} > 4.8 \times 10^{-3}$. The implied A_V is > 3.6 .

The galaxy is unresolved in CHSS with a 1.49 GHz radio flux of 41.2 mJy but CHYT resolve the galaxy at 8.44 GHz with a size of $0.18'' \times 0.14''$. The 1.49 GHz continuum flux with the FIR flux gives a somewhat high q-value of 2.56 which may be related to the OH megamaser (see the discussion in Section 5.1.2).

5.2.3. UGC 02369

UGC 02369 is a close pair of galaxies aligned north-south and separated by about $30''$ (Figure 4). The northern component is brighter in the visible and NIR (Carico et al. 1990b) but the radio positions and the fact that we recover essentially all of the IRAS flux (within our errors) while centered on the southern component establish that the southern galaxy produces almost all the FIR flux. Mid-infrared ISOCAM images (Hwang et al. 1999) also show this component to be dominant at those wavelengths. While VLBI maps of the source show some evidence for small scale structure, the emission appears to be too strong and compact to come from star forming regions. An AGN power source for the radio emission seems likely (Smith, Lonsdale, & Lonsdale 1998). Mirabel & Sanders (1988) find H I in absorption in UGC 02369 and estimate a column density of $2.2 \times 10^{19} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ with

an assumed spin temperature of 100 K.

We fail to resolve UGC 02369 either directly (Figure 4) or through our flux estimates, which are consistent with IRAS within the errors. Hwang et al. (1999) claim that the ISOCAM source is slightly resolved at $15\ \mu\text{m}$ in $3''$ pixels. They do not cite a size explicitly, but it appears to be close to that of our $100\ \mu\text{m}$ size limit of $12''$. Using this limit and the BGS 60 and $100\ \mu\text{m}$ fluxes we obtain a dust temperature of $\sim 36.6\ \text{K}$ and a visual extinction of greater than ~ 3.9 for the system. When combined with the CHSS 1.49 GHz radio flux of 50 mJy, the q-value is a normal 2.32.

5.2.4. NGC 1275

NGC 1275 is a giant elliptical galaxy (Figure 5) associated with the radio source 3C 84 at the core of the Perseus cluster. Not only does this galaxy have a strong AGN but it also is associated with a cooling flow and two systems of low ionization filaments, one of which is probably the remnants of a recent merger. See Lester et al. (1995) analysis of the $100\ \mu\text{m}$ flux from NGC 1275 with the same data.

The optical size from the Uppsala General Catalog of Galaxies (UGC, Nilson 1973) is $3.5' \times 2.5'$. We clearly resolve the core at $100\ \mu\text{m}$ (Figure 5b) and show that $D_g = 30''$ and $D_e = 17''$. The exponential disk fit from fluxes gives a size of only $D_e \sim 13''$ but given the uncertainty of the fluxes and the effective beam size, the $17''$ estimate is probably more accurate. Using the single slab model, the 60 and $100\ \mu\text{m}$ fluxes from the BGS2, and the diameter of the emitting region of $17''$ we obtain a dust temperature T_d of 44 K and an optical depth of 8.4×10^{-4} which corresponds to an $A_V \sim 0.6$. Because NGC 1275 is not a spiral and the exponential disk model may not represent the galaxy well, we also note here that with the Gaussian $D_g = 30''$ the temperature remains nearly the same but the optical depth and corresponding visual extinction drop so that $A_V \sim 0.2$ (Table 7). In any case A_V is low enough that optical images should represent the population from the galaxy fairly well.

5.2.5. VII Zw 31

This galaxy is only a fuzzy blob on the POSS (Figure 6) with an optical extent of $10''$ or less. According to optical profiles from Djorgovski, de Carvalho, & Thompson (1990) the FWHM is less than $5''$. These authors also mention an object $\sim 20''$ to the north-

west of the galaxy that is either a companion or the remains of a merger. The large luminosity in the FIR $\log(L_{\text{FIR}}/L_\odot) = 11.6$ of VII Zw 31 only became apparent with the advent of IRAS (Fairclough, 1986) but its distance of $\sim 220\ \text{Mpc}$ (Sanders, Scoville, & Soifer 1991) suggests not only that its angular extent will be small but that its FIR flux will be small as well.

Sage & Solomon (1987) measured the CO emission from VII Zw 31 and discovered that the galaxy contains $5 \times 10^{10} M_\odot$ of gas, which is roughly half of the dynamical mass of the galaxy. Other observations (Sanders et al. 1991; Radford, Solomon, & Downes 1991; Scoville et al. 1989) have confirmed this tremendous gas mass and show that the size of the CO emitting region is not resolved with a beam-size of $7''$. The surface density of the gas is therefore must be $> 1000 M_\odot/\text{pc}^2$. This is ~ 5 times greater than the mean surface density of $\sim 170 M_\odot/\text{pc}^2$ of giant molecular clouds in our galaxy (Sage & Solomon 1987; Solomon et al. 1987). Because of the large gas mass, Sage & Solomon suggested that VII Zw 31 could be a proto-galactic disk that has yet to form most of its mass into stars. However, Djorgovski et al. (1990) argue that VII Zw 31 is more likely a “merger-induced starburst” that has yet to use up most of the gas acquired in the merger. New CO interferometer observations by Downes and Solomon (1998) clearly show evidence for a rapidly rotating nuclear ring on a scale of several hundred parsecs (a few arcseconds).

We did not resolve VII Zw 31 by its profile and our determination of its flux only marginally suggests spatial extension (Figure 6). All of the FIR emission is thus likely to be produced within or around the CO emitting region. In our data of VII Zw 31 detector 1 gave an anomalous and inconsistent high flux. Because of this, we took our baseline through detectors 2, 9, and 10, and our “sum of detectors” flux is for detectors 2-10 only. Using the maximum size of the CO emitting region as the maximum extent of the FIR (Diameter = $7''$), the thermal dust model gives a dust temperature $\sim 34\ \text{K}$ and an optical depth of $\tau_{100} > 2.0 \times 10^{-2}$, which corresponds to a large $A_V > 15$.

5.2.6. UGC 05101

UGC 05101 is a disturbed spiral galaxy extended east-west in the optical with both a large ring (Sanders et al. 1988; Whitmore et al. 1990), and a jet (Sanders et al. 1988) or tidal tail (Majewski et al. 1993) ex-

tending at least $40''$ to the west. This latter feature is just visible on the DSS images (Figure 7). There is only one core in near infrared images (Carico et al. 1990a, Genzel et al. 1998) and several theories have been advanced to account for the morphology, the FIR luminosity of $\log(L_{FIR}/L_{\odot}) = 11.77$, and the presence of an active core with a LINER/Seyfert 2 emission spectrum (Majewski et al. 1993). Sanders et al. (1988) explain the ring and active core of UGC 05101 as the result of an interaction with another gas rich spiral which they claim could have already merged to the core of UGC 05101 or is hidden behind the bright disk and jet. Majewski et al. (1993) offer a similar picture but also argue the object $17''$ to the southeast is a gas-poor dwarf galaxy which may have caused the ring and AGN. In addition Majewski et al. (1993) argue that the structure of UGC 05101 could be the result of two interactions, the first causing the AGN and tidal tail and the second causing the ring. Carico et al. (1990a). These authors suggest a companion $50''$ to the west but do not mention the object claimed as a galaxy by Majewski et al. (1993). Radio maps (CHSS; Condon & Broderick 1988) show a weaker component object $\sim 45''$ to the northeast of the main core of UGC 05101, which has no counterpart on the DSS frame (Figure 7) or on the deep images of Sanders et al. (1988).

To within our errors we did not resolve the inner core of UGC 05101 (detectors 4,5,6) in the FIR, consistent with the small ($< 5''$) sizes seen in the radio (CHSS, Sopp & Alexander 1991). However, we note in Figure 7 an apparently significant excess of flux in detector 7, on the west side of the galaxy, as well as a possible slight deficit of flux at the center compared to the IRAS flux. These detectors lay along the optical jet or tidal tail that extends to the west, and detector 7 is where that tail crosses the ring. The signal in detector 7 alone could correspond to a source with a total flux of 5.8 ± 1.3 Jy. At the distance of UGC 05101 (~ 160 Mpc, CHSS) this corresponds to a $100 \mu\text{m}$ luminosity (νL_{ν}) of $\sim 10^{11} L_{\odot}$. The optical images of Sanders et al. (1988) show no optical concentration at this position. The K-band images of Genzel (1998) do not include this position in their field of view.

Since we did not resolve UGC 05101 we used the minimum size $D_e < 12''$, the IRAS fluxes, and several FIR and sub-millimeter points (Rigopoulou, Lawrence, & Rowan-Robinson 1996; Carico et al. 1992) to produce a $T_d \sim 34.7$, a $\tau_{100} > 1.3 \times 10^{-2}$,

an $A_V > 8.5$, and $n \sim 1.50$. The galaxy q-value of 2.10 is slightly low as might be expected for a galaxy with a radio weak AGN undergoing a large starburst. The tail seen in the optical and in the FIR does not seem to have a radio counterpart. So the evidence for an extra FIR source associated with this tail makes the low q-value for this galaxy even more difficult to explain.

5.2.7. NGC 3110

NGC 3110 is a low inclination spiral with a companion about $2'$ to the southwest near the end of one of its two distinct spiral arms (Figure 8). The system has a $\log(L_{FIR}/L_{\odot}) = 10.96$ and a rather large gas mass (as estimated from CO detection by Sanders et al. (1991) of $2 \times 10^{10} M_{\odot}$). This galaxy presents a fairly unique opportunity. Since it is not too far away (65 Mpc, CHSS), it subtends a substantial angle across the sky ($> 60'' \times 30''$) but it is still very luminous. It provides a good opportunity to resolve a fairly typical FIR luminous galaxy.

We clearly resolve the core of NGC 3110 (Figure 8) and derive a $D_g \sim 24''$ and a $D_e \sim 13''$. However, our photometry strongly suggests even further extension. Our detector 5 flux (corrected for minor miscentering) and sum of detectors 1-10 flux both are $\sim 33\%$ below the IRAS flux (Table 4). This suggests that not only the core that we resolved is extended, but the FIR emission area is extended enough that a substantial portion of the FIR flux escaped of our detector array entirely. From the flux received in detectors 11-20 (not shown here, perhaps 5 Jy) and assuming a similar amount of FIR emitting area is spread on the other side of the detector 1-10 arm (to the east), much of the flux discrepancy can be accounted for. The almost exact coincidence of the IRAS source with NGC 3110 suggests that little of the IRAS flux comes from the companion to the southwest. So we conclude that the core of NGC 3110 is extended at least on a scale of $13''$, and beyond the core the disk or arms of the galaxy contribute up to 35% of the total FIR flux.

Using the derived sizes of the core, our array-summed $100 \mu\text{m}$ flux, and a $60 \mu\text{m}$ flux scaled so that the S_{100}/S_{60} ratio remains the same as for the BGS fluxes as well as a 1.25 mm point (Carico et al. 1992) scaled similarly, we obtain a core dust temperature of 32.1 K and a rather high A_V of 8.3. The CHSS radio flux includes both the core and the disk so we only have the system q of 2.22 using BGS fluxes.

5.2.8. NGC 4151

Despite the fact that NGC 4151 has a Seyfert 1 active core, it is more representative of “normal” nearby galaxies because of its relatively low luminosity of $\log(L_{FIR}/L_{\odot}) = 9.5$ (using $D = 17$ Mpc, Hunt & Giovanardi 1992). The source has an optical size of about $4' \times 3'$ on the red Palomar Sky Survey plate (Nilson 1973). An ionization cone, marked by a narrow emission line region, occupies the central ten arc-seconds, and is extended along an axis roughly perpendicular to the stellar disk. We included NGC 4151 in our target list to confirm earlier observations of large extension on the scale of $\sim 100''$ at $155 \mu\text{m}$ (Engargiola et al. 1988) and $100 \mu\text{m}$ (Gaffney et al. 1992).

Somewhat surprisingly, the extension is not obvious in the FIR profiles (Figure 9), which offers a stark contrast against the profiles of the high luminosity galaxies. We do not resolve the core but, even more so than for NGC 3110, we do not recover the entire IRAS flux either. This suggests that much of the flux is extended beyond the effective beam of our detectors. Our 1-10 detector flux sum is ~ 4.1 Jy which leaves ~ 4.5 Jy of the large-beam IRAS flux unaccounted for. If this flux were distributed evenly over the optical disk “ellipse” seen in Figure 9a of $\sim 150'' \times 75''$ we would be insensitive to the remaining flux because of the baseline we removed from our profiles.

Added confidence in this picture of a compact far infrared core containing about half the total flux surrounded by a very extended envelope comes from ISOPHOT observations of this object (Rodríguez Espinosa et al. 1996) which give a C100 ISOPHOT flux of 5-6 Jy at $100 \mu\text{m}$ in $43''$ pixels, compared with the 8.6 Jy IRAS flux.

Thus we do not directly detect disk emission but only infer it from the differences in flux. If the central point source were not present, we would not have detected the galaxy at all! Our observations are not sufficient to determine if the excess IRAS flux is from the inner $100''$ as suggested by the evidence for extension in the Engargiola et al.(1988) data, but they do not conflict with that suggestion.

The unresolved core flux of 4.1 Jy might be due to direct (non-thermal) emission from the AGN, but an explanation based on distributed sources from the disk with a diameter of < 1 kpc is more likely in view of the fact that the spectral slope into the submillimeter is steeper than the $\alpha \sim 2.5$ which is considered the

steepest slope possible from synchrotron-self absorption (Engargiola et al. 1988; Edelson et al. 1988). Whatever the source of flux in the unresolved core, about half of the total luminosity of NGC 4151 originates outside of that unresolved core. Little of this extended FIR flux can be due to dust heated by the AGN.

Assuming the bolometric energy production of the galaxy is about twice that which eventually comes out in the FIR from AGN heated dust, our model (a copy of that of Barvainis 1987) suggests that dust heated by the AGN should produce emission on scales of $\sim 28''$ or greater if the dust geometry were such that there was dust at this distance with a unobscured view of the AGN in the center. We would have detected emission on this scale if dust heating by the AGN was a significant source of the FIR emission. ISO observations (Rodríguez Espinosa et al. 1996) appear to confirm that the FIR flux is thermal emission from dust heated by stars. The FIR data fit a blackbody of $T = 36$ K while a warmer dust component heated by the AGN has $T = 170$ K.

It is unlikely that the AGN dominates the the FIR emission either from its direct emission or from the dust that it may heat, but the AGN does make its presence clear in the radio. The comparatively strong radio flux from the AGN (Condon 1987) skews the q -value to a very low value of 1.4 when we use the IRAS fluxes.

5.2.9. UGC 08696

UGC 08696 (also known as Markarian 273) is a well observed galaxy with an optically conspicuous jet or tail extending to the south for at least $1'$ (Figure 10). Sanders et al. (1988) included it in their sample of ultra-luminous IR galaxies because of its high FIR luminosity of $\log(L_{FIR}/L_{\odot}) = 11.9$. It is one of the most luminous galaxies in our sample. Veilleux et al. (1995) classify the nuclear source as a LINER from the optical emission line ratios but it is called a Seyfert 2 elsewhere (e.g. Khachikian, & Weedman 1974).

UGC 08696 contains an OH megamaser (Schmelz, Baan, & Haschick 1987) which corresponds spatially to the main optical component and main radio component (CHSS, Sopp & Alexander 1991). There are two radio components aligned NW-SE and separated by $\sim 1''$ with the NW component dominating. In the NIR however, the SE component disappears and is

replaced by a component to the SW (Majewski et al. 1993; Zhou et al. 1993; Carico et al. 1990b). In addition, Sanders et al. (1988) mention that there is a companion galaxy $40''$ to the north of the main component in the direction opposite the jet. This companion appears starlike on the DSS frame.

We do not significantly resolve the core of UGC 08696 directly at $100\ \mu\text{m}$ (Figure 10) but we do not quite recover the full IRAS flux of 22 Jy (BGS) in a point source either. The sum of our detectors 1-10 gives a flux of 17 ± 3 and the detector 5 flux is a similar 18 ± 2 . The optical tail also emits in the radio (CHSS) and so the additional far infrared flux seen in the IRAS data may be located there. Our second bank of detectors crosses nearly over the companion galaxy, but we do not see a recognizable local maximum in the far infrared emission at that position. While the excess emission can plausibly originate in the jet, it is noteworthy that Turner, Urry and Mushotsky (1993) show a bright serendipitous x-ray source that is approximately coincident with the star-like object at the DSS image in Figure 10. Neither of these regions are sampled in our data. On the other hand, a component of emission that is spatially offset from the main peak might be expected to displace the IRAS peak. The IRAS peak is, however, coincident with the radio source.

Using our $100\ \mu\text{m}$ flux and a $60\ \mu\text{m}$ flux scaled so the ratio of $S(60)/S(100)$ is the same as in the BGS we obtain, with the CHSS 1.49 GHz radio flux, a q -value of 2.16 which is comparatively low. Using the IRAS fluxes the q -value becomes 2.27, much closer to the expected 2.34 ± 0.2 (Condon et al. 1991a). In addition, using other sub-millimeter to millimeter fluxes (Rigopoulou, Lawrence, & Rowan-Robinson 1996; Krügel et al. 1988) the best fit single temperature dust model gives a dust emissivity exponent $n = 1.35$ when we use our observed $100\ \mu\text{m}$ flux and the scaled $60\ \mu\text{m}$ point. When we use the Soifer et al. 1989 fluxes, the exponent $n = 1.51$. In general, astronomical dust is thought to have an $n = 1 - 2$ (Carico et al. 1992), but for every other galaxy for which we can calculate an exponent n , we generally obtain a value near or greater than 1.5 (Table 8).

The low q -value and low n we obtain when we used our fluxes suggests the higher IRAS $100\ \mu\text{m}$ flux is a better match to the other wide beam (full system) measurements. Simple subtraction of the our detector 1-10 flux sum from the IRAS flux gives a possible flux for the tail of 5.1 ± 2.9 which corresponds to a

luminosity (νL_ν) of $1.2 \times 10^{11} L_\odot$.

Using the BGS fluxes and the upper limit of $12''$ for the FIR diameter of the emitting region (along with the sub-millimeter fluxes mentioned above) we obtain a best fit dust temperature of 42.0 K and an optical depth at $100\ \mu\text{m}$ of $> 6.4 \times 10^{-3}$ which implies an $A_V > 4.8$.

5.2.10. NGC 6090

NGC 6090 is a pair of galaxies separated by $\sim 10''$ and aligned NE-SW (Figure 11a). According to Martin et al. (1991) the optical cores of the two galaxies are in contact and the system also includes “wings” (barely visible in the DSS frame) which makes the pair reminiscent of the famous “Antennae” system. The entire system has an optical size $2.8' \times 1.5'$ (Nilsson 1973) although our DSS image (Figure 11) shows that the optical cores have a combined size of $20'' \times 10''$ with a larger size around the northern dominant galaxy.

Despite the fact that our array was aligned along the NE-SW line between the two galaxies, we did not resolve NGC 6090 (Figure 11). Essentially the entire IRAS $100\ \mu\text{m}$ flux is recovered in our beam. The approximate point source we observed is skewed towards detector 4 as we might expect if the southwestern source were responsible for a significant part of the emission, but due to our pointing errors, this cannot be confirmed. The radio map in CHSS shows that the northeastern source is dominant in the radio. Our small size ($D_e < 12''$) is consistent with the radio size of the system given by CHSS as $5'' \times 7''$.

We note that Hwang et al. (1999) used ISOCAM images to detect some small extension of NGC 6090 at $15\ \mu\text{m}$ but their peak-to-total flux analysis did not provide quantitative spatial information that can be compared to our data. It is also noteworthy that Bushouse, Telesco, and Werner (1998) found little or no evidence for extension of this source at $10\ \mu\text{m}$ from ground-based data.

ISO photometry (Acosta-Pulido 1996) has given the energy distribution of NGC 6090 from 3.6 to $200\ \mu\text{m}$ and shown that the galaxies are in fact dominated by starburst heated dust. The authors of this work suggest without elaboration that the source is resolved with ISOPHOT in the $60\ \mu\text{m}$ band, though other galaxies in the field may have contributed to this impression. Acosta-Pulido et al. (1996) also suggest a second, subsidiary dust component with $T_d = 20$

K, but they do not use the $1300\ \mu\text{m}$ measurement of Chini et al. (1992) because of the small beamsizes ($11''$) used for this measurement compared with the ISO beamsizes.

Since the angular size we derive is $< 12''$ we feel confident in using the $1300\ \mu\text{m}$ point with our data. Our model (without the ISO data) then gives $T_d = 31\text{K}$, $\tau_{100} > 8.9 \times 10^{-2}$, and $n \sim 2.3$.

5.2.11. NGC 6286

NGC 6286 is an edge-on spiral in an interacting pair with the spiral NGC 6285 $\sim 1.5'$ to the northwest (Figure 12). The optical extension of NGC 6286 is $1.3' \times 1.2'$ (Nilson 1973). Unfortunately, the long axis of our array was aligned almost perpendicular to the long axis of the galaxy and we do not get nearly as much information about FIR emission along the disk as we might have had if we had a more favorable array alignment. Filaments and plumes seen in deep CCD images as well as a faint shell-like feature extending about $0.5'$ to the ESE of NGC 6286 (barely visible in our DSS image) cause Whitmore et al. (1990) to brand NGC 6286 a possible polar ring galaxy.

Despite the poor position angle, we may have resolved NGC 6286 along the polar axis (Figure 12). The flux in detector 3 is well above the PSP, and we do not recover the IRAS flux in a point source. The $D_g = 21''$ while the $D_e = 12''$. The sum of detector 1-10 fluxes match the IRAS flux well. The fact that we still resolve the emission although the galaxy disk is not aligned with our array suggests that the extended FIR emission is likely to be associated with some non-disk component. In this respect, we note that detector 3, which sits on the shell-like feature to the ESE is well above the point source profile. Using the size of $12''$, our flux for detectors 1-10 at $100\ \mu\text{m}$ and a flux from Surace et al. (1993) for NGC 6286 which excludes the contribution from NGC 6285 at $60\ \mu\text{m}$ we get the lowest dust temperature of our sample of $T_d = 28.6$ (when we also use the $1.25\ \text{mm}$ value from Carico et al. (1992) to get $n = 1.77$). Our optical depth measurement of $\tau_{100} = 3.2 \times 10^{-2}$ translates into an $A_V = 24$.

Aside from the large deviation from a point source in detector 3, the FIR emission can be attributed to a nuclear bulge, leaving little evidence for disk emission. Radio maps (CHSS; CHYT) show only slight emission from the disk as well.

The q-value for NGC 6286 is 2.01 which is slightly

lower than those of most other galaxies. Our higher resolution observations confirm that NGC 6285 is not responsible for the anomaly. Lonsdale et al. (1993) classify NGC 6286 (misnamed NGC 6285 in their paper) as H II spectral type, but Veilleux et al. (1995) classify it as having a LINER spectrum so it is possible that NGC 6286 contains a weak AGN core which adds extra radio flux and lowers the q-value from the strong starburst.

5.2.12. IRAS 17132+5313

IRAS 17132+5313 is a double galaxy aligned E-W with the eastern component brighter in the visible and radio (Figure 13). The two components are separated by about $10''$. Interestingly, most studies of the system in the radio have concentrated on the weaker western component because it is very compact. The eastern component was resolved by CHSS with a size of $3'' \times 1.6''$ and it has an H II like spectrum (Veilleux et al. 1995). The western component is resolved by both CHYT and by Lonsdale et al. (1993) who classify the western source as an AGN.

We did not resolve the galaxy at $100\ \mu\text{m}$ (Figure 13). The IRAS flux is slightly higher than our value but is within the errors. The companion galaxy about $1'$ to the southeast of the dominant pair may contribute some significant flux to the IRAS value since it emits $\sim 13\%$ of the total radio flux.

We model IRAS 17132+5313 with the full IRAS fluxes from the BGS and use the unresolved upper limit of $12''$. The model provides a dust temperature of $37\ \text{K}$ and an optical depth at $100\ \mu\text{m}$ of $> 3.6 \times 10^{-3}$ which corresponds to an A_V of > 2.7 . The FIR flux along with the total CHSS $1.49\ \text{GHz}$ radio flux of $25.8\ \text{mJy}$ give a q-value of 2.51.

5.2.13. IRAS 17208-0014

IRAS 17208-0014 is an extremely luminous and distant system which like VII Zw 31 seems to have a large amount of gas concentrated in a very small volume. It is formally the most luminous source in our sample, and provides one of our more surprising results. From single dish observations of the CO, Mirabel et al. (1990) obtain a molecular gas mass of $5.5 \times 10^{10} M_\odot$. Observations with the Owens Valley interferometer array get a similar amount. The CO emission is spatially unresolved and so has a scale size of $< 3''$. Observations in the CO J(2-1) line (Rigopoulou et al. 1996) provide a smaller estimate

for the gas mass of only $3.8 \times 10^9 M_\odot$.

IRAS 17208-0014 also contains a OH megamaser (Martin et al. 1989) suggesting a cloud in front of a continuum source, and so it is not surprising that H I is strong in absorption. The H I column density is $1.7 \times 10^{22} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ if a spin temperature of 100 K is assumed.

Our 100 μm fluxes for IRAS 17208-0014 are 19.4 ± 4 Jy (sum of detectors 1-10) and 24.8 ± 3 Jy (detector 5). These are both far below the BGS2 flux of 38 Jy. The spatial distribution shows no particularly great deviation from a point-source at 100 μm (Figure 14). The DSS image shows a fairly crowded field, but no extended companions which could be responsible for the extra flux are apparent (Figure 14). There are no apparent companions in the K-band either (Zenner & Lenzen 1993; Murphy et al. 1996). We could find no radio observations which might point out any existing companion in the field. We do note that in the deep red band image of Murphy et al. (1996) an arm extends to the east about $30''$ from the core; it may be that IRAS detected FIR emission from this arm and our smaller beam did not. This image also shows what appears to be a bridge of emission connecting the galaxy with the starlike object $0.5'$ to the north, and it is possible that this bridge and separate source, which are not well sampled by our array, accounts for some of the missing energy. But these explanations are complicated by the fact that the IRAS centroid is identical to ours, suggesting that any missing flux should be symmetrically distributed around the center. Another possibility is that the FIR flux of this source is variable but radio observations at 4.85 GHz show no significant variation from 1987 to 1992 (Becker, White, & Edwards 1991; Griffith et al. 1995; Condon, Anderson, & Broderick 1995), and the source spectrum is clearly thermal throughout the infrared.

With the 1.425 GHz radio flux of 102 mJy from Condon et al. (1995) and the 4.86 GHz flux of 61 mJy from Condon et al. (1996) we obtain a power law slope of $\alpha = -0.42$ ($S_\nu \propto \nu^\alpha$) and a 1.49 GHz value of 100 mJy from which we obtain a q-value of 2.62 when using the BGS2 FIR fluxes. The q-value with the BGS2 FIR fluxes and the 4.86 GHz value is 2.85. Both of these q-values are somewhat high. Summing the flux across our array, and using a 60 μm value such that the ratio between the 60 and 100 μm points matched the ratio of the BGS2 values, we obtained much more normal q-values of 2.33 and 2.56

for 1.49 GHz and 4.85 GHz respectively. See Section 5.1.2 for a brief discussion on the possibility that OH megamaser galaxies have high q-values.

With its very compact size (unresolved with $3''$ beam in CO), the simple modeling of IRAS 17208-0014 (with our 100 μm flux, and the IRAS 60 μm flux scaled so as to match the Sanders et al. 1995 flux ratio) gives a very high optical depth of $\tau_{100} > 9.3 \times 10^{-2}$ which corresponds to an $A_V > 70$. This is by far the highest optical depth we have calculated for our sample.

5.2.14. UGC 10923

UGC 10923 (Mkn 1116) is a multiple system with an interacting companion only $15''$ to the northeast of the main component. The DSS frame shows an apparent bridge connecting these components to a compact object $20''$ to the northwest. Another galaxy lies $50''$ to the southeast. Our data shows conclusively that most of the FIR flux comes from the cluster galaxies on the west side (Figure 15a). Because of its low 60 μm flux UGC 10923 is not in the BGS and so is less often observed than other FIR luminous galaxies. The object is poorly documented in the literature. Bushouse (1987) observed UGC 10923 at the 21 cm line in H I and estimates a atomic gas mass of $7 \times 10^9 M_\odot$. In addition, Bushouse provides an H α image which shows a size of $\sim 20''$ in the western group.

From the comparison to the point source function (Figure 15) it is clear that we resolved UGC 10923 at 100 μm . The H α size is well matched by the $20''$ size of our resolved Gaussian model (D_g). Summing over all our detectors, we recover the IRAS flux (Mazzarella et al. 1991) to within our errors.

Away from the central source, the emission appears to be distributed mostly eastward the more distant component. That component itself does not appear to be a significant contributor to the 100 μm flux. The IRAS centroid is offset from the main component slightly toward the east, which is consistent with our findings.

Using the IRAS fluxes, an additional upper limit of 5.7 mJy at 1300 μm from Chini, Krügel, & Kreysa (1992), and the $D_e = 11''$ size of the region, we calculate a dust temperature < 28 K, an optical depth at 100 μm $> 2.1 \times 10^{-2}$, and a dust emissivity exponent $n > 2.2$. This value for n is nearly as high as any other emissivity exponent for dust we calculate and it is higher than the normally accepted estimates of $n =$

1 - 2 for dust (Carico et al. 1992) but its low value depends entirely on the low upper limit given by Chini et al. (1992). The τ_{100} corresponds to an $A_V > 16$ so the H α is probably leaking out of the starburst region.

We found no published radio fluxes at or near 1.49 GHz for UGC 10923 but Marx et al. (1994) give fluxes at 4.76 GHz and 10.7 GHz from which we derive a flux at 4.85 GHz. When combined with the IRAS fluxes the derived radio flux provides a normal q- value (for 4.85 GHz) of 2.68.

5.2.15. NGC 7469

NGC 7469 is a bright, luminous, and well observed SBA galaxy with a Seyfert 1 core (Genzel et al. 1995, Cutri et al. 1984). The companion IC 5283 is about $\sim 80''$ to the north. NGC 7469 has an optical size of $100'' \times 60''$ (Nilson 1973) but our DSS frame only shows the core with a size of $\sim 40'' \times 20''$ (Figure 16). Near IR profiles show a sharply peaked distribution with scale size of $\sim 2''$ (Zenner & Lenzen 1993) or less (Terndrup et al. 1994; Mazzarella et al. 1994; Genzel et al. 1995). There is $1.5 \times 10^{10} M_\odot$ of H_2 concentrated in the central $2''$ of NGC 7469 as determined by studies of CO emission (Meixner et al. 1990) and somewhat less of H I (Mirabel & Sanders 1988). Some of this gas is concentrated in a clumpy nuclear ring of radius $\sim 1.5''$ seen in radio (Wilson et al. 1991; CHYT), visible light (Mauder et al. 1994), and even at $11.7 \mu\text{m}$ (Miles, Houck, & Hayward 1994). In addition, NGC 7469 shows emission lines from polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) from the extranuclear region (Miles et al. 1994; Mazzarella et al. 1994; Cutri et al. 1984). Miles et al. (1994) point out that these molecules would be destroyed by the X-ray flux from the active core of NGC 7469 and note that shielding by clumps of gas with $N_H > 10^{23}$ atoms cm^{-2} could protect them.

Despite the assertion that the majority of the $\log(L_{FIR}/L_\odot) = 11.2$ is concentrated within the circumnuclear ring with a $\sim 2''$ diameter (Genzel et al. 1995) we may have see a very small fraction of 100 μm flux on a considerably larger scale (Figure 16). Our fitting and deconvolution on this high S/N object allows some superresolution, and gives $D_g = 14''$ and $D_e = 7''$. While the majority of the FIR flux lies on scales well below our resolution there may be some flux extended beyond the circumnuclear ring. Photometrically, we recover exactly the IRAS flux, within our errors and so cannot use a flux deficit to estimate the size.

With our estimate of $D_e = 7''$, the single slab model for the dust gives $\tau_{100} > 5 \times 10^{-2}$, which we convert to an $A_V > 35$. This extinction cannot surround the AGN since it is easily visible in the optical. We note also that using $N_H/A_V = 1.9 \times 10^{25}$ (Bohlin, Savage, & Drake 1978) we get the column density $N_H > 6.7 \times 10^{22}$, which is high enough to adequately shield the PAHs (Miles et al. 1994).

The flux we obtained for NGC 7469 used only detectors 1-9 for both the baseline and the flux by summation of detectors. We did this because of the excess flux seen by detector 10, which is close to IC 5283. While the IRAS position does not appear to be biased by this companion, and the IRAS flux was recovered in detectors that excluded it, our data is suggestive that IC 5283 contributes modestly to the luminosity of the system. These two galaxies were resolved separately at 12 and 25 μm with HIRES studies on the IRAS database (Surace et al. 1993). In this study, IC 5283 was found to be less than 5% of NGC 7469 at 25 μm – a ratio that is surprisingly small given the conspicuousness of the former in our dataset, in which it is probably only partly sampled. It would appear that IC 5283 has a cooler spectrum than NGC 7469.

Optical studies of this pair (Marquez and Moles 1994) show that IC 5283 is, in itself, a strongly disturbed system. There appears to be little evidence for a substantial stellar or gaseous component bridging the systems, and the lack of 100 μm emission between them (in our detectors 7-9) is therefore not surprising.

5.2.16. NGC 7541

NGC 7541 (Figure 17) is a relatively nearby (36 Mpc, CHSS) disturbed starburst spiral with an optical size of $3.4' \times 1.1'$ (Nilson 1973). Radio maps by CHSS and Colbert et al. (1996) also give a rather extended size of $60'' \times 24''$, with little central concentration. At 10 μm the small aperture ($5''$) to large aperture ($100''$) compactness ratio is $C = 0.07$ (Giuricin et al. 1994). The non-point-like flux distributions at radio and 10 μm wavelengths suggest that the FIR flux of NGC 7541 will also be extended.

NGC 7541 has been observed often in H I (Lu et al. 1993; Oosterloo & Shostak 1993). We use a value of 47 mJy which implies an atomic gas mass of $9 \times 10^9 M_\odot$ (Mirabel & Sanders 1988). This is approximately twice the molecular gas mass of $4.5 \times 10^9 M_\odot$ (Sanders et al. 1986). The usual ratio of molecular to atomic gas masses in FIR luminous galaxies is

~ 2 -5 (Mirabel & Sanders 1988) and so in this respect the ratio of $\sim 1/2$ makes NGC 7541 look more like a quiescent galaxy.

We easily resolve NGC 7541 at $100\ \mu\text{m}$ along the minor axis of the galaxy (Figure 17). Our fitted Gaussian gives $D_g = 23''$ while the fitted disk model gives a $D_e = 12.5''$. A note in CHSS says the companion NGC 7537, which lies several arcminutes to the southwest, may contribute to the IRAS flux. Our summed flux (38.7 ± 6.0 Jy) is consistent with the IRAS flux of 40.6 Jy, so we have recovered the entire IRAS flux despite the alignment of our array along the minor axis of NGC 7541. These facts taken together would argue that the morphology of the $100\ \mu\text{m}$ emission is more circular than the very elongated optical contours. If distributed like the optical emission, we would have missed most of the flux in our array.

We note parenthetically that our array position did not cover the site of the recent supernova 1998d, a SNIa which was discovered $50''$ W and $10''$ N of the center.

Using the single slab model, IRAS fluxes, and the 1.25 mm flux from Carico et al. (1992) we get $\tau_{100} = 3.4 \times 10^{-2}$. This gives $A_V = 26$ which is not unreasonable for an edge-on spiral.

5.2.17. Zw 475.056

Zw 475.056 (IC 5298) (Figure 18) is a Seyfert 2 galaxy (Veilleux et al. 1995) which has an associated OH maser (Mirabel & Sanders 1987). The molecular gas shows a double peaked line with a strength that corresponds to a mass of $9.4 \times 10^9 M_\odot$ (Mirabel & Sanders 1987). The double peaked line is also apparent in the H I observations and is typical of galaxies which have not undergone interactions. The H I line strength suggests an atomic gas mass of $5.5 \times 10^9 M_\odot$ (Mirabel & Sanders 1987). Considering the fact that all the other OH megamaser sources in the sample show at least some H I absorption, the double peak structure of the gas lines here may be due to foreground absorption of the galaxy (Mirabel & Sanders 1987). If it is an absorption feature, the gas masses quoted above are only lower limits.

Our profile of Zw 475.056 (Figure 18) does not show significant evidence for extension and our $100\ \mu\text{m}$ point source fluxes matches the IRAS BGS flux well. Using $D_e < 12''$ we derive a dust temperature of 38 K and an optical depth at $100\ \mu\text{m}$ greater than 5.0×10^{-3} which corresponds to an $A_V > 3.8$. That

the IRAS position is significantly displaced from the place where we see all the flux, and no companions that might confuse the centroiding are evident, has no obvious explanation.

VLBI observations of Zw 475.056 (Lonsdale et al. 1993) resolve the core as do the VLA observations in CHYT. These latter data show that the core of the galaxy, on scales less than an arcsecond, is oriented NNW-SSE as in the larger scale optical (Figure 18) and I-band (Zenner & Lenzen 1993) contours. The faint halo with $\sim 20''$ extent visible in the optical (see the DSS image Figure 18 is not visible in the I, H and K. These images show only a core less than $10''$ in diameter (Zenner & Lenzen 1993). This halo evidently does not contribute much of the $100\ \mu\text{m}$ emission. The radio flux for Zw 475.056 at 1.49 GHz (CHSS) provides a q-value of 2.53 which is somewhat above the average value of 2.34. A flux at 4.85 GHz (Sopp & Alexander 1992) gives a q-value of 2.97 which is also higher than normal. See the discussion on OH megamasers having high q-values in Section 5.1.2.

5.2.18. NGC 7625

NGC 7625 is a type Sa/S pec galaxy with a comparatively modest luminosity. Unlike most early type galaxies, it happens to have a great deal of gas and dust associated with it and large star formation rate (Li et al. 1993). A dust lane is conspicuous in the DSS image (Figure 19). The optical size of the galaxy extends to $1.5' \times 1.5'$ (Nilson 1973) but comparisons of the sizes of the blue light, the CO, the H α , and the 20 cm emitting regions along the major axis of rotation (PA $\sim 28^\circ$) show that each of these tracers give a FWHM of $\sim 10''$ (Li et al. 1993). NGC 7625 has a molecular gas mass of $\sim 2.4 \times 10^9 M_\odot$ and an atomic mass of about the same amount (Li et al. 1993).

Our $100\ \mu\text{m}$ profile (Figure 19) is peaked between detectors 4 and 5, while the optical peak should have been between detectors 5 and 6. This suggests that the FIR is skewed slightly to the south away from the optical (Li et al. 1993) and large beam 1.49 GHz radio (CHSS) position which we attempted to center up on. That pointing position also corresponds well to the H α and H I center while the CO and small beam radio centers appear to be several arcseconds to the northwest. Significantly, the FIR peak corresponds spatially better with the prominent dust lane, and the centroid of the outer optical contours.

Though our point source flux is consistent with

that of IRAS, there is some slight evidence for extension of NGC 7625 in the profile, (Figure 19) and we obtain a $D_g = 21.8''$ and $D_e = 13''$ which matches the sizes of the other tracers of the starburst activity. Using the derived disk size of $13''$ in the single slab model, we derive a $T_d = 32$ K and a $\tau_{100} = 1.2 \times 10^{-2}$ which translates into an $A_V = 9$.

5.2.19. NGC 7770/7771

NGC 7770/7771 is an interacting system with the larger spiral galaxy NGC 7771 separated from its companion to the southwest by about $80''$ (Figures 20; 21). NGC 7771 is a luminous system that contains a well defined starburst ring (Smith et al. 1999) with a major axis of $6''$. The optical morphology is strongly affected by extinction. We found that both galaxies are emitting in the FIR although the system is dominated by NGC 7771. Both galaxies also have optical spectra classified as H II emission-dominated (Kim et al. 1995; Veilleux et al. 1995).

We did not spatially resolve the core of NGC 7771 (Figure 21), which argues that essentially all of the far infrared emission comes from within the starburst ring, the diameter of which is just below our detection limit for spatial extension. Our observations of NGC 7770 are too noisy to determine a size (Figure 20), so we do not produce a model to determine its optical depth. Our observations of NGC 7770 do suggest that it may not be a point source, however, and the I-band image shown in Smith et al. shows a $20''$ extent that has little central condensation.

Using BGS fluxes (with both the 100 and $60 \mu\text{m}$ fluxes scaled by the radio ratio) for NGC 7771 as well as the 1.25 mm point from Carico et al. (1992) we obtain a dust temperature of 33 K. The model also gives an optical depth at $100 \mu\text{m}$ $\tau_{100} > 2.3 \times 10^{-3}$ and a dust emissivity exponent $n \sim 1.49$. The τ_{100} corresponds to an $A_V > 17$.

Using the radio fluxes from CHSS and BGS fluxes give a normal q-value of 2.39 for the system. We note here that despite its small flux compared to its companion, NGC 7770 is fairly luminous by itself with $\log(L_{\text{FIR}}/L_{\odot}) = 10.20$. This is enough to classify it as a FIR luminous galaxy and help to confirm the suggestion that in interacting galaxies, both partners are often FIR enhanced (Surace et al. 1993, Bernlöhner 1993).

5.2.20. Markarian 331

Markarian 331 (Figure 22) is a FIR luminous galaxy with an HII-like optical spectrum (Veilleux et al. 1995). The galaxy shows both emission and absorption in H I with an atomic gas mass $> 9.55 \times 10^9 M_{\odot}$ and column density of $7 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ if a spin temperature of 100 K is assumed (Mirabel & Sanders 1988). The estimated molecular gas mass is $1.29 \times 10^{10} M_{\odot}$ (Sanders et al. 1991).

We do not resolve Mkn 331 (Figure 22) and our flux matches the IRAS BGS flux to within our errors. The IRAS position is offset from the radio position (CHSS) in the direction of two faint galaxies $\sim 1.5'$ to the southwest. While this offset might suggest that one of the nearby companions is responsible for some of the FIR flux assigned to this object, and is introducing a bias into the large beam position centroid, our photometry does not support this explanation, and we note that the IRAS error ellipse is fairly large.

Using the Soifer et al. 1989 FIR fluxes and a upper limit of 8.7 mJy from Chini et al. (1992) we estimate a dust temperature near 35 K, an optical depth $\tau_{100} > 1.5 \times 10^{-2}$, and a dust emissivity exponent $n > 2.01$. The corresponding $A_V > 8.6$. The q-value with the radio value from CHSS is a moderately high 2.51.

5.2.21. UGC 12915

UGC 12915 is the smaller of a closely interacting pair of galaxies (Figure 23). UGC 12914 is only $1.5'$ to the southwest. Both galaxies are obviously disturbed spirals with prominent tidal tails and even a ring around UGC 12914. Radio maps (Condon et al. 1993; CHSS; Condon et al. 1991b) show not only that the galaxies are radio sources, but that the space between them is a radio source as well, such that only $\sim 58\%$ of the radio flux is localized around the individual galaxies. Because it is stronger in the radio and perhaps at $60 \mu\text{m}$ as well, we chose to center our array on UGC 12915. The second arm of the array fell between the two galaxies allowing us to see if any of the FIR flux was coming from the radio bridge.

We resolved UGC 12915 in our first set of observations in 1994 August and found a $D_g = 24''$ or a $D_e = 12''$. Our measured $100 \mu\text{m}$ flux in detectors 1-10 was 9.9 Jy, compared to 13.4 Jy from IRAS, suggesting that about a quarter of the emission originates elsewhere. The second arm of the array seemed to show evidence for substantial FIR emission from the radio bridge but the uncertainty was high.

In order to confirm the photometry we duplicated the observation of UGC 12915 in our flight series of 1995 August. The new observations (Figure 23, Table 4) confirm the size very well; they give $D_g = 24''$ and $D_e = 14''$. The 1995 observations also match the 1994 flux estimate with a $100\ \mu\text{m}$ flux of 11.6 Jy. The new observations allow for only slight FIR from the radio bridge. Condon et al. (1993) claim that about 25% of the $60\ \mu\text{m}$ flux is from UGC 12914. Assuming similar colors, the difference between our $100\ \mu\text{m}$ flux and the large beam IRAS flux from BGS (13.4 Jy) is easily explained by flux from UGC 12914.

Using the disk size of $14''$, our detector 1-10 summed $100\ \mu\text{m}$ flux, and a $60\ \mu\text{m}$ flux scaled so that the S_{60}/S_{100} ratio is the same as in the BGS, we obtain a $T_d = 31\ \text{K}$ and a $\tau_{100} = 7.7 \times 10^{-3}$ for UGC 12915.

Condon et al. (1993) had assumed that the low 1.49 GHz q-value for the UGC 12914/5 system of 1.94 occurred because the radio bridge was emitting radio synchrotron but not FIR. Our observations have confirmed that there is little if any FIR from the area between the galaxies. Now that we have the $100\ \mu\text{m}$ flux for UGC 12915 we can attempt to calculate its q-value independently. We use our 1995 August $100\ \mu\text{m}$ flux in detectors 1-10 and a flux for $60\ \mu\text{m}$ scaled so that the S_{60}/S_{100} ratio matches the Soifer et al. 1989 flux ratio. With the Condon et al. (1993) 1.49 GHz flux for UGC 12915 of 47 mJy, we calculate a $q = 2.26$. This normal q-value also confirms that the abnormally low system q-value is caused by the extra radio emission from the bridge and not from the disk of UGC 12915.

6. Discussion

Our observational techniques have been effective in probing the structure of far infrared emission in galaxies on very small scales. Of the 22 galaxies, we see at least some evidence for extension of the $100\ \mu\text{m}$ emission, either by comparison with point source profiles, or by missing peak flux, in 12 (MCG +02-04-25, NGC 1275, UGC 05101, NGC 3110, UGC 08696, NGC 6286, IRAS 17208-0014, UGC 10923, NGC 7541, NGC 7625, NGC 7770, and UGC 12915). The emission from NGC 4151 appears to be very large, and is mostly outside our sampling area.

There are several possible explanations for the strong FIR emission from the sample galaxies. These include: (1) emission from an active galactic nucleus (AGN), (2) emission from dust heated by an AGN,

(3) emission from dust heated by a massive burst of star formation, (4) emission by dust heated by an stellar population (5) emission by dust heated by the UV photons produced by shocks in galaxy collisions, and (6) emission by dust heated by extremely hot gas from a galaxy cluster cooling flow. Clearly, not all of these mechanisms are possible in all of the galaxies in our sample. Mechanisms (1) and (2) are only possible for those galaxies with an AGN, mechanism (5) is only possible for those systems with multiple galaxies or galaxy cores, and mechanism (6) only applies to NGC 1275 because it is the lone galaxy in our sample with a cooling flow. We will describe the expected sizes of FIR emitting regions for these mechanisms below and then compare expected sizes with our observed sizes at $100\ \mu\text{m}$.

6.1. Emission from AGN and Emission from Dust Heated by AGN

If the core is resolved, little of the FIR emission can come directly from the point-like AGN. For galaxies with a FIR $D_g > 20''$ (barely resolved), we find that 50% of the flux could come directly from a point source only if the remaining emission from the galaxy disk had $D_g > 40''$. Radio maps of the galaxy disks in those galaxies we resolved (CHSS; Condon et al. 1996) do not show substantial emission at such scales. To first order, radio distributions appear to be larger than the FIR for galaxy disks (Bicay & Helou 1990; Marsh & Helou 1995; Lu et al. 1996). So a point-like AGN would provide less than 25% of the FIR flux to a marginally resolved source and even less to the flux of a source that is more clearly resolved.

Dust heating by the AGN is another process which might produce some of the extended emission. A model that assumes the dust is optically thin in the IR and is distributed spherically around the AGN (Barvainis 1987) suggests that in order to match both the observed FIR luminosity and $\sim 40\ \text{K}$ dust temperatures with a central AGN heating source, the dust must have a direct line of sight to that source (for instance if the dust was in a warped disk – see Sanders et al. 1989) and also must be several kiloparsecs (typically $> 30''$) away from the AGN. Any substantial amount of dust closer to the AGN would have a higher temperature and so would move the peak emission to shorter wavelengths. In addition, the model AGN luminosity cannot be lowered to allow $\sim 40\ \text{K}$ dust at smaller radii or else the FIR luminosity will drop below the observed levels. Only for MCG+02-04-025 do

the sizes we estimated for the FIR flux from AGN heated dust and the observed sizes match ($D_g \sim 19''$ for both), but it has an H II like optical spectrum. Galaxies with high FIR emission tend to be complicated systems, often undergoing or having already undergone interactions AGN activity is at least as likely to be the result of the interaction as it is likely to be a determining factor in the far infrared energetics of the system.

6.2. Emission from Dust Heated by Starbursts

Massive star formation is a more likely source for the energy that heats the dust in FIRLGs. Most of the galaxies in the sample show clear evidence for widespread and intense star formation, usually a central region with an emission spectrum that resembles an H II region (see Table 2). The FIR emitting region would then be expected to be similar in size to the starbursting region because the large amount of dust in typical star forming regions causes the mean free path of the UV photons to be very small. The expected sizes of the FIR emitting regions in this case would be variable from galaxy to galaxy but would correspond to the extent of photoionized gas, as traced by the emission lines. Most of our target galaxies show far infrared distributions that are consistent with the spatial tracers of massive star formation.

Starburst region sizes can be assumed to be the same as that of the H α regions in galaxy images if the extinction is small or sufficiently patchy. A quick search of the literature for H α region sizes for galaxies we clearly resolved provides three galaxies, each with an H α region with FWHM $\sim 20''$ (NGC 7625, Li et al. 1993; UGC 10923 and UGC 12915, Bushouse 1987). These widths are a good match to the observed FIR sizes (D_g) listed in Table 5. So the H α sizes support the starburst theory of FIR emission for these resolved galaxies.

6.3. Emission from Dust Heated by Older Stars

It is also possible that older stellar populations provide some of the energy to heat the dust in luminous IR galaxies, but unless this population is hugely in excess of that indicated by the optical and near infrared tracers of the red stellar population, it is unlikely that they could dominate the energetics in the luminous systems. In particular, the NIR and FIR

fluxes are not correlated in the most luminous FIR luminous galaxies (Harwit et al. 1987), and the colors imply insignificant extinction towards that older population (Harwit et al. 1987; Houck et al. 1985). For the lowest luminosity galaxies in our sample, the NIR luminosities are close enough to the FIR luminosities that dust heated by red giants might contribute to the FIR. However, even these low luminosity galaxies mostly show H II emission line spectra and large H α luminosities suggestive of dominance by a younger starburst. NGC 4151 is a noteworthy case, in that we find a large part of the far infrared emission from that galaxy to be clearly extended on a scale that is similar to the near infrared light, and over a region that has little or no ionized gas.

6.4. Emission from Other Mechanisms

Other mechanisms of heating the dust such as collisions of galaxies (Harwit et al. 1987) and the interaction of the dust with a cluster cooling flow (Lester et al. 1995) may affect certain galaxies in our sample. It is of interest, in this context, that the far infrared emission in these systems is concentrated in one or both of the interacting components. In the interacting systems that are easily resolved by our measurements, we see no evidence for large amounts of far infrared emission from intranuclear parts. While a large fraction of our sample seems to have undergone collisions, only a few seem to still be so close that their molecular disks could be currently colliding. The fact that these galaxies continue to produce copious FIR long after their collisions (e.g. 2×10^7 years after the collision for UGC 12915, Condon et al. 1993) argues against the collision heating mechanism for most, since the gas cooling time is ~ 1000 times less than the collision time (Harwit et al. 1987). NGC 1275 and its associated cooling flow may be special in this regard (Lester, 1995).

7. Conclusion

We have observed the distribution of 100 μ m continuum emission in 22 galaxies, most of which have $L_{FIR} > 10^{11} L_{\odot}$. We clearly resolved the emission ($D_g > 20''$, $D_e > 12''$) in 6 of them. We also see some evidence for extension in 7 others.

For every resolved and possibly resolved source in our sample except for MCG+02-04-025, NGC 4151 and NGC 1275, we are able to eliminate all possible methods for FIR production except for starburst

heated dust. Of the galaxies we could not resolve, most show correspondingly small starburst regions, and our size limits are consistent with those regions dominating the energetics.

In a few cases, most notably NGC 3110, the disk of the galaxy makes a substantial contribution to the FIR flux. The contribution of the disk of NGC 3110, and the extended emission outside the bright cores in MCG+02-04-025 and NGC 6286 suggest that it is imprudent to assume all of the FIR flux in more distant FIR luminous galaxies (that we do not resolve) is concentrated in the core. A better universal model for the FIR flux distribution for these galaxies would be a strong central core on top of an extended “plateau” of emission from the disk.

For the systems we resolved, we used the core sizes in a simple, single slab emission model to estimate not only the dust temperature T_d , but also the optical depth at $100\ \mu\text{m}$ τ_{100} , assuming a dust emissivity exponent of $n = 1.5$ (emissivity $Q \propto \lambda^{-n}$). In addition, when they were available, we used fluxes at longer wavelengths that we assumed were still associated with the thermal dust emission. The additional flux measurements when combined with the measurements at 60 and $100\ \mu\text{m}$ allow us to solve for the emissivity exponent, n , as well. These measured values of n are all equal to or greater than 1.5 and two far exceeded the expected range of 1-2 (e.g. Carico et al. 1992; see Table 8).

With the values of τ_{100} , we calculated an estimate for the visual extinction (via $A_V/\tau_{100} \sim 750$ for our galaxy, Makinen et al. 1985). Assuming that the stars are well mixed with the dust, we can tell how much the visible light from the galaxy (and in particular the FIR flux producing region) is extinguished. The single slab model is incapable of dealing with geometrical situations that almost surely exist in all of these galaxies such as a central condensation of material. Therefore the A_V estimates are only a rough indicator of the true extinction of the galaxy. The A_V estimates vary from an insignificant value of ~ 0.2 in NGC 1275 to an extremely high value of ~ 35 in NGC 7469. Interestingly, and probably not surprisingly, some of the highest extinctions we obtained came from those spiral galaxies which we view edge-on.

We do not have enough resolving power to determine how the q -value varies within these distant FIR luminous galaxies. We do, however, have enough resolution to separate galaxy pairs for which IRAS gives only one flux. We confirm that UGC 2369(south),

NGC 3110, NGC 6286, UGC 10923(west), NGC 7469, NGC 7541, NGC 7771, and UGC 12915 dominate the FIR flux over their companions. Our observations confirm that the q -value for NGC 6286 is unusually low. We also derive a new $q = 2.26$ for UGC 12915. The new value confirms that it is the radio bridge and not low FIR flux from the disk of UGC 12915 that causes the low q -value for the system.

Our project has developed strategies that will be of use for future missions, in particular SOFIA. The large aperture of SOFIA will immediately provide a factor of three improvement in resolution over KAO. New detector arrays being developed for SOFIA instruments (e.g. HAWC) will better sample this diffraction spot. In addition, the higher sensitivity of SOFIA will not only provide sensitivity to the structure at small scales, but will more specifically make available a large number of asteroids for point source and flux calibration.

We would like to thank Beverly Smith, Chris Koresko, and James DiFrancesco for help with making the observations, as well as aiding in the data reduction. We are grateful to Cheng-Yue Zhang for writing some of the data reduction software. We also wish to thank the staff of the KAO for their support throughout each of our flight series. This program was funded under the NASA Airborne Astronomy Program NAG2-748.

This research has made use of the NASA/IPAC Extragalactic Database (NED) which is operated by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Caltech, under contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The optical light images from this paper as well as the data for the Guide Star Catalog (GSC) are from the Digital Sky Survey project which used the Palomar Observatory Sky Survey (POSS; funded by the National Geographic Society).

REFERENCES

- Acosta-Pulido, J. A. et al. 1996, *A&A*, 315, L121
- Baan, W. A., Haschick A. D., & Uglesich, R. 1993, *ApJ*, 415, 140
- Barvainis, R. 1987, *ApJ*, 320, 537
- Barvainis, R., Antonucci, R., & Coleman, P. 1992 *ApJ*, 399, L19
- Becker, R. H., White, R. L., & Edwards, A. L. 1991, *ApJS*, 75, 1
- Bernlöhr, K. 1993, *A&A*, 268, 25
- Bicay, M. D., & Helou, G. 1990, *ApJ*, 362, 59
- Bohlin, R. C., Savage, B. D., & Drake, J. F. 1978, *ApJ*, 224, 132
- Bregman, J. N., McNamara, B. R., & O'Connell, R. W. 1990, *ApJ*, 351, 406
- Bushouse, H. A. 1987, *ApJ*, 320, 49
- Bushouse, H. A., Telesco, C. M., & Werner, M. W. 1998, *AJ*, 115, 938
- Chapman, J., Staveley-Smith, L., Axon, D., Unger, S., Cohen, R., Pedlar, A., & Davies, R. 1990, *MNRAS*, 244, 281
- Carico, D. P., Graham, J. R., Matthews, K., Wilson, T. D., Soifer, B. T., Neugebauer, G., & Sanders, D. B. 1990a, *ApJ*, 349, L39
- Carico, D. P., Keene, J., Soifer, B. T., & Neugebauer, G. 1992, *PASP*, 104, 1086
- Carico, D. P., Sanders, D. B., Soifer, B. T., Matthews, K., & Neugebauer, G. 1990b, *AJ*, 100, 70
- Chini, R. 1992, in *The Infrared and Submillimetre Sky After COBE*, eds. Signore, M., & Dupraz, C. (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press), 249
- Chini, R., Krügel, E., & Kreysa, E. 1992, *A&A*, 266, 177
- Colbert, E., Baum, S., Gallimore, G., O'Dea, C., and Christensen, J. 1996, *ApJ*, 467, 551
- Condon, J. J. 1987, *ApJS*, 65, 485
- Condon, J. J., Anderson, E., & Broderick, J. J. 1995, *AJ*, 109, 2318
- Condon, J. J., Anderson, M. L., & Helou, G. 1991a, *ApJ*, 376, 95
- Condon, J. J., & Broderick, J. J. 1988 *AJ*, 96, 30
- Condon, J. J., Helou, G., Sanders, D. B., & Soifer, B. T. 1990, *ApJS*, 73, 359 (CHSS)
- Condon, J. J., Helou, G., Sanders, D. B., & Soifer, B. T. 1993, *AJ*, 105, 1730
- Condon, J. J., Helou, G., Sanders, D. B., & Soifer, B. T. 1996, *ApJS*, 103, 81
- Condon, J. J., Huang, Z. -P., Yin, Q. F., & Thuan, T. X. 1991, *ApJ*, 378, 65 (CHYT)
- Condon, J. J., Frayer, D. T., & Broderick, J. J. 1991b, *AJ*, 101, 362
- Cutri, R. M., Rudy, R. J., Rieke, G. H., Tokunaga, A. T., & Willner, S. T. 1984, *ApJ*, 280, 521
- de Jong, T., Clegg, P. E., Soifer, B. T., Rowan-Robinson, M., Habing, H. J., Houck, J. R., Aumann, H. H., & Raimond, E. 1984, *ApJ*, 278, L67
- Diamond, P. J., Lonsdale, C. J., Lonsdale, C. J., & Smith, H. E. 1999 *ApJ*, 511, 178
- Djorgovski, S., de Carvalho, R. R., & Thompson, D. J. 1990, *AJ*, 99, 1414
- Downes, D., & Solomon, P. M. 1998 *ApJ*, 507, 615
- Dwek, E., & Arendt, R. G. 1992, *ARA&A*, 30, 11
- Edelson, R. A., Gear, W. K. P., Malkan, M. A., & Robson, E. I. 1988, *Nature*, 336, 749
- Edelson, R. A., & Malkan, M. A. 1987, *ApJ*, 323, 516
- Edelson, R. A., Malkan, M. A., & Rieke, G. H. 1987, *ApJ*, 321, 233
- Elston, R., Cornell, M. E., & Lebofsky, M. J. 1985, *ApJ*, 296, 106
- Engargiola, G., Harper, D. A., Elvis, M., & Willner, S. P. 1988, *ApJ*, 332, L19
- Gaffney, N. I., Lester, D. F., Harvey, P. M., Smith, B. J., Colomé, C., Doppmann, G. W., & Malkan, M. 1992, *BAAS*, 24, 728
- Genzel, R., Weitzel, L., Tacconi-Garman, L. E., Blietz, M., Cameron, M., Krabbe, A., Lutz, D., & Sternberg, A. 1995, *ApJ*, 444, 129

- Genzel, R. et al. 1998, *ApJ*, 498, 579
- Giuricin, G., Tamburini, L., Mardirossian, F., Mezzetti, M., & Monaco, P. 1994, *ApJ*, 427, 202
- Griffith, M. R., Wright, A. E., Burke, B. F., & Ekers, R. D. 1995 *ApJS*, 97, 347
- Harrington, R. S., Douglass, G. G., Kallarakal, V. V., Smith, C. A., & Guetter, H. H. 1983, *AJ*, 88, 1376
- Harvey, P. M. 1979, *PASP*, 91, 143
- Harvey, P. M., Lester, D. F., Brock, P., & Joy, M. 1991, *ApJ*, 368, 558
- Harwit, M., Houck, J. R., Soifer, B. T., & Palumbo, G. G. C. 1987, *ApJ*, 315, 28
- Helou, G., Khan, I. R., Malek, L., & Boehmer, L. 1988, *ApJS*, 68, 151
- Helou, G., Soifer, B. T., & Rowan-Robinson, M. 1985, *ApJ*, 298, L11
- Houck, J. R. et al. 1984, *ApJ*, 278, L63
- Houck, J. R., Schneider, D. P., Danielson, G. E., Beichman, C. A., Lonsdale, C. J., Neugebauer, G., & Soifer, B. T. 1985, *ApJ*, 290, L5
- Hunt, L. K., & Giovanardi, C. 1992, *AJ*, 104, 1018
- Hwang, C.-Y., Lo, K. Y., Gao, Y., Gruendl, R. A., & Lu, N. Y. 1999, *ApJ*, 511, L17
- Jones, T. J., et al. 1993, *ApJ*, 411, 323
- Khachikian, E., & Weedman, D. W. 1974, *ApJ*, 192, 581
- Kim, D. -C., Sanders, D. B. Veilleux, S., Mazzarella, J. M., & Soifer, B. T. 1995, *ApJS*, 98, 129
- Kojoian, G., Elliott, R., & Bica, M. D. 1981, *AJ*, 86, 816
- Krügel, E., Chini, R., Kreysa, E. & Sherwood, W. A. 1988, *A&A*, 190, 47
- Lawrence, A., Walker, D., Rowan-Robinson, M., Leech, K. J., Penston, M. V. 1986, *MNRAS*, 219, 687
- Lebofsky, L. A., et al. 1986, *Icarus*, 68, 239
- Lester, D. F., Zink, E. C., Doppmann, G. W., Gaffney, N. I., Harvey, P. M., Smith, B. J., & Malkan, M. 1995, *ApJ*, 439, 185
- Li, J. G., Seaquist, E. R., Wrobel, J. M., Wang, Z., & Sage, L. J. 1993, *ApJ*, 413, 150
- Lonsdale, C. J., Smith, H. E., & Lonsdale, C. J. 1993, *ApJ*, 405, L9
- Lu, N. Y., Helou, G., Tuffs, R., Xu, C., Malhotra, S., Werner, M. W., & Thronson, H. 1996, *A&A*, 315, L153
- Lu, N. Y., Hoffman, G. L., Groff, T., Roos, T., & Lamphier, C. 1993, *ApJS*, 88, 383
- Majewski, S. R., Hereld, M., Koo, D. C., Illingworth, G. D., & Heckman, T. M. 1993, *ApJ*, 402, 125
- Makinen, P., Harvey, P. M., Wilking, B. A., & Evans, N. J. 1985, *ApJ*, 299, 341
- Marsh, K. A. & Helou, G. 1995, *ApJ*, 445, 599
- Martin, J. M., Bottinelli, L., Dennefeld, M., & Gouguenheim, L. 1991, *A&A*, 245, 393
- Martin, J. M., Bottinelli, L., Dennefeld, M., Gouguenheim, L., & Le Squeren, A. M. 1989, *A&A*, 208, 39
- Márquez, I., & Moles, M. 1994, *AJ*, 108, 90
- Marx, M., Krügel, E., Klein, U., & Wielebinski, R. 1994, *A&A*, 281, 718
- Mauder, W., Weigelt, G., Appenzeller, I., & Wagner, S. J. 1994, *A&A*, 285, 44
- Mazzarella, J. M., Bothun, G. D., & Boroson, T. D. 1991, *AJ*, 101, 2034
- Mazzarella, J. M., Voit, G. M., Soifer, B. T., Matthews, K., Graham, J. R., Armus, L., & Shupe, D. 1994, *AJ*, 107, 1274
- Meixner, M., Puchalski, R., Blitz, L., Wright, M. H. C., & Heckman, T. M. 1990 *ApJ*, 354, 158
- Miles, J. W., Houck, J. R., & Hayward, T. L. 1994, *ApJ*, 425, L37
- Mirabel, I. F., Booth, R. S., Garay, G., Johansson, L. E. B., & Sanders, D. B. 1990, *A&A*, 236, 327
- Mirabel, I. F., & Sanders, D. B. 1987, *ApJ*, 322, 688

- Mirabel, I. F., & Sanders, D. B. 1988, *ApJ*, 335, 104
- Murphy, T. W. Jr., Armus, L., Matthews, K., Soifer, B. T., Mazzarella, J. M., Shupe, D. L., Strauss, M. A., & Neugebauer, G. 1996, *AJ*, 111, 1025
- Muller, T. G. & Lagerros, J. 1998, *A&A*, 338, 340
- Nilson, P. 1973, *Uppsala General Catalogue of Galaxies*, (Uppsala Astr. Obs. Ann., 6)
- Oosterloo, T., & Shostak, S. 1993, *A&AS*, 99, 379
- Planesas, P., Mirabel, I. F., & Sanders, D. B. 1991, *ApJ*, 370, 172
- Radford, S. J. E., Solomon, P. M., & Downes, D. 1991, *ApJ*, 368, L15
- Rigopoulou, D., Lawrence, A., & Rowan-Robinson, M. 1996, *MNRAS*, 278, 1049
- Rigopoulou, D., Lawrence, A., White, G. J., Rowan-Robinson, M., & Church, S. E. 1996, *A&A*, 305, 747
- Rodríguez Espinosa, J. M., Pérez García, A. M., Lemke, D., & Meisenheimer, K. 1996, *A&A*, 315, L129
- Sage, L. J., & Solomon, P. M. 1987, *ApJ*, 321, L103
- Sanders, D. B., Egami, E., Lipari, S., Mirabel, I. F., & Soifer, B. T. 1995, *AJ*, 110, 1993 (BGS2)
- Sanders, D. B., Phinney, E. S., Neugebauer, G., Soifer, B. T., & Matthews, K. 1989, *ApJ*, 347, 29
- Sanders, D. B., Scoville, N. Z., & Soifer, B. T. 1991, *ApJ*, 370, 158
- Sanders, D. B., Scoville, N. Z., Young, J. S., Soifer, B. T., Schloerb, F. P., Rice, W. L., & Danielson, G. E. 1986, *ApJ*, 305, L45
- Sanders, D. B., Soifer, B. T., Elias, J. H., Madore, B. F., Matthews, K., Neugebauer, G., & Scoville, N. Z. 1988, *ApJ*, 325, 74
- Schmelz, J. T., Baan, W. A., & Haschick, A. D. 1987, *ApJ*, 321, 225
- Scoville, N. Z., Sanders, D. B., Sargent, A. I., Soifer, B. T., & Tinney, C. G. 1989, *ApJ*, 345, L25
- Seyfert, C. K. 1943, *ApJ*, 97, 28
- Smith, B. J., Harvey, P. M., Colomé, C., Zhang, C. Y., DiFrancesco, J., & Pogge, R. W. 1994, *ApJ*, 425, 91
- Smith, D., Herter, T., Haynes, M. & Neff, S. 1999, *ApJ*, 510, 669
- Smith, H. E., Lonsdale, C. J., & Lonsdale, C. J. 1998, *ApJ*, 492, 137
- Soifer, B. T. et al. 1984, *ApJ*, 278, L71
- Soifer, B. T., Boehmer, L., Neugebauer, G., & Sanders, D. B. 1989, *AJ*, 98, 766 (BGS)
- Soifer, B. T., Houck, J. R., & Neugebauer, G. 1987, *ARA&A*, 25, 187
- Solomon, P. M., Rivolo, A. R., Mooney, T. J., Barrett, J. W., & Sage L. J. 1987, in *Star Formation in Galaxies*, ed. C. Lonsdale (Washington: NASA Conference Publication 2466), 37
- Sopp, H., & Alexander, P. 1991, *MNRAS*, 251, 112
- Sopp, H., & Alexander, P. 1992, *MNRAS*, 259, 425
- Surace, J. A., Mazzarella, J., Soifer, B. T., & Wehrle, A. E. 1993, *AJ*, 105, 864
- Telesco, C.M., and Harper, D.A. 1980, *ApJ*, 235, 392
- Terndrup, D. M., Davies, R. L., Frogel, J. A., Depoy, D. L., & Wells, L. A. 1994, *ApJ*, 432, 518
- Trotter, A. S., Moran, J. M., Greenhill, L. J., Zheng, X-W, Gwinn, C. R. 1997 *ApJ*, 485, L79
- Turner, T. J., Urry, C. M., & Mushotzky, R. F. 1993, *ApJ*, 418, 653
- Veilleux, S., Kim, D. -C., Sanders, D. B., Mazzarella, J. M., & Soifer, B. T. 1995, *ApJS*, 98, 171
- Whitmore, B. Z., Lucas, R. A., McElroy, D. B., Steiman-Cameron, T. Y., Sackett, P. D., & Olling, R. P. 1990, *AJ*, 100, 1489
- Wilson, A. S., Helfer, T. T., Haniff, C. A., & Ward, M. J. 1991, *ApJ*, 381, 79
- Wilson, A. S., & Ulvestad, J. S. 1982, *ApJ*, 263, 576
- Zenner, S., & Lenzen, R. 1993, *A&AS*, 101, 363
- Zhou, S., Wynn-Williams, C. G., & Sanders, D. B. 1993, *ApJ*, 409, 149

Fig. 1.— The nomenclature and coordinate system of the array is schematically shown as it is superimposed on a galaxy.

Fig. 2.— MCG+02-04-025 We show at bottom the shape and average orientation of our detector array as it is projected on the sky at the position noted in Table 1. Detectors 1 and 10 are marked, to facilitate comparison with the plot of detected signal. In several cases we make qualitative reference to the secondary array (detectors 11-20) in the text, and so these detectors have been outlined with dashed rectangles. The optical image is from the Digital Sky Survey (DSS) with north to the top and east to the left. For scale a bar 1' long is also shown. The true position angle of the array varied by an amount noted in Table 1. The X marks the IRAS position of the galaxy (BGS), surrounded by the IRAS error ellipse. At the top of the figure, we show the relative flux and errors for each detector in the primary array (squares and solid lines). Detector 1 is leftmost, and detector 10 rightmost. Also included are a point source profile scaled and shifted to match the galaxy observations near the peak flux (dashed line), and a point source profile scaled to the IRAS flux of the galaxy and shifted to the position where it best fits the entire profile (dotted line).

Comparison with the dashed line therefore tests the extent to which the observed source has a point-like profile, and comparison with the dotted line tests how well our observations match a point source with the IRAS flux density.

Fig. 3.— III Zw 35 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 4.— UGC 02369 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 5.— NGC 1275 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 6.— VII Zw 31 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 7.— UGC 05101 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 8.— NGC 3110 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 9.— NGC 4151 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 10.— UGC 08696 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 11.— NGC 6090 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 12.— NGC 6286 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 13.— IRAS 1713+53 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 14.— IRAS 1720-00 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 15.— UGC 10923 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 16.— NGC 7469 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 17.— NGC 7541 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 18.— Zw 475.056 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 19.— NGC 7625 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 20.— NGC 7770 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 21.— NGC 7771 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 22.— Markarian 331 as in Figure 2.

Fig. 23.— UGC 12915 as in Figure 2.

This figure "fig01sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig02sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig03sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig04sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig05sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig06sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig07sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig08sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig09sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig10sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig11sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig12sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig13sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig14sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig15sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig16sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig17sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig18sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig19sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig20sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig21sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig22sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

This figure "fig23sm.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003439v1>

TABLE 1
TARGET GALAXIES AND OBSERVATION LOG

Galaxy	R.A. (1950)	Dec. (1950)	Ref.	Date	Rot. ^a	Calib. ^b
MCG+02-04-025	01:17:23.17	+14:05:58.8	2	06/01/94	0	CEK
III Zw 35	01:41:47.90	+16:51:06.3	1	29/08/9	3.9	IS
UGC 02369	02:51:15.9	+14:46:03	3	29/08/95	1.4	IS
NGC 1275	03:16:29.5	+41:19:52.2	5	06/01/94	18.5	CEK
VII Zw 31	05:08:17.5	+79:36:40	8	12/08/94, 16/08/94	15.2	Pal.
UGC 05101	09:32:04.78	+61:34:37.0	3	06/01/94	0	CEK
NGC 3110	10:01:32.0	−06:13:56	2	06/01/94	4.6	CEK
NGC 4151	12:08:01.06	+39:41:02	9	06/01/94	6.0	CEK
UGC 08696	13:42:51.71	+56:08:14.3	3	26/08/95	6.5	IM
NGC 6090	16:10:24.58	+52:35:05.4	3	12/08/94, 16/08/94	9.7	Pal.
NGC 6286	16:57:44.99	+59:00:41.7	3	16/08/94	7.2	Pal.
IRAS 1713+53	17:13:14.14	+53:13:49.3	2	26/08/95, 29/08/95	18.7	IM,IS
IRAS 1720-00	17:20:47.87	−00:14:15.9	7	26/08/95	0	IM
UGC 10923	17:36:23.6	+86:46:38	6	26/08/95, 29/08/95	14.7	IM,IS
NGC 7469	23:00:44.41	+08:36:15.8	3	16/08/94	0	Pal.
NGC 7541	23:12:11.2	+04:15:41	2	12/08/94	4.2	Pal.
Zw 475.056	23:13:33.1	+25:17:01.6	3	29/08/95	6.3	IS
NGC 7625	23:18:00.0	+16:57:07	2	16/08/94	0	Pal.
NGC 7770	23:48:49.9	+19:49:13	2	26/08/95	3.3	IM
NGC 7771	23:48:52.1	+19:50:01	2	26/08/95	2.1	IM
Markarian 331	23:48:54.1 ^c	+20:18:28.8	3	29/08/95	4.4	IS
UGC 12915	23:59:08.3	+23:13:00.0	4	26/08/95 ^d	N	3.9 IM

^aAngle in degrees over which the array rotated during the observations.

^bCalibrator source. CEK: 1 Ceres, 52 Europa, and 97 Klotho average; Pal: 2 Pallas; IM: 704 Interamnia and 56 Melete average; IS: 704 Interamnia and 386 Siegena average.

^cThis is the pointing position. The CHYT position is actually 23:48:54.03.

^dUGC 12915 also was observed on 16 Aug. 1994, values given in the tables are for the Aug. 1995 observation (See Section 5.2.21)

REFERENCES.— (1) Chapman et al. 1990; (2) Condon et al. 1990 (CHSS); (3) Condon et al. 1991 (CHYT); (4) Condon et al. 1993; (5) Harrington et al. 1983; (6) Kojoian et al. 1981; (7) Martin et al. 1989; (8) Sage & Solomon 1987; (9) Wilson & Ulvestad 1982.

TABLE 2
DISTANCES, LUMINOSITIES, RADIO FLUXES, AND q

Galaxy	Distance ^a (Mpc)	$\log L_{FIR}^b$ ($L_{\odot}$)	$S_{1.49GHz}$ (mJy)	Radio Ref.	q	Type	Type Ref.
MCG+02-04-025	123	11.3	49.1	3	2.32	HII	9,13
III Zw 35	108	11.3	41.2	3	2.56	AGN	13
UGC 02369	123	11.3	50.0	3	2.32	HII	13
NGC 1275	68	10.7	24000 ^c	5	-0.44	AGN	12
VII Zw 31	218	11.6	41.6	5	2.28	HII	6
UGC 05101	164	11.8	150.0	3	2.10	AGN	11,13
NGC 3110	66	10.9	109.0	3	2.22	HII	13
NGC 4151	17	9.5	332.0 ^c	2	1.42	AGN	12
UGC 08696	157	11.9	143.0	3	2.27	AGN	11,13
NGC 6090	122	11.2	46.4	3	2.27	HII	13
NGC 6286	80	11.0	142.0	3	2.01	HII,AGN	9,13
IRAS 1713+53	208	11.6	25.8	3	2.51	HII	13
IRAS 1720-00	174	11.9	102.0	5	2.33	HII	13
UGC 10923	103	11.0	48.2	10	2.19	...	...
NGC 7469	66	11.3	169.0	3	2.33	AGN	12,13
NGC 7541	35	10.7	150.0	3	2.32	HII	7
Zw 475.056	110	11.2	33.6	3	2.53	AGN	13
NGC 7625	23	9.9	42.0	3	2.50	HII	8
NGC 7770	58	10.2	16.5	3	2.37	HII	13
NGC 7771	58	11.0	107.3	3	2.39	HII	13
Markarian 331	72	11.1	67.6	3	2.51	HII	13
UGC 12915	61	10.6	47.	4	2.26	HII	1

^aThis assumes $H_0 = 75 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ and is corrected for Virgocentric infall. Taken from refs (3) and (5) except for NGC 4151 from Hunt & Giovanardi (1992) and UGC 10923 from Mazzaralla et al. (1994).

^bUsing distance in second column and FIR flux (see equation 3, section 5.1.2) appropriate for the radio flux given in column 4

^cvariable

REFERENCES.— (1) Berlöhr 1993; (2) Condon 1987; (3) CHSS; (4) Condon et al. 1993; (5) Condon et al. 1996; (6) Djorgovski et al. 1990; (7) Giuricin et al. 1994; (8) Li et al. 1993; (9) Lonsdale et al. 1993; (10) Marx et al. 1994; (11) Sanders et al. 1988; (12) Seyfert 1943, (13) Veilleux et al. 1996.

TABLE 3
ASTEROID COUNTS AND DERIVED RESPONSIVITIES

Asteroid	Predicted flux (Jy)	Counts $\Sigma 1 - 10$	Counts Detector 5	Resp. ^a $\Sigma 1 - 10$	Resp. ^b Detector 5
01/06/1994					
1 Ceres	145 ± 14	24375 ± 698	11088 ± 216		
52 Europa	39.4 ± 4	7520 ± 562	3319 ± 151	196.3 ± 17	84.8 ± 6
97 Klotho	10.5 ± 1	2168 ± 342	858 ± 91		
08/12/94 and 08/16/94					
2 Pallas	74.0 ± 7	8914 ± 961	3829 ± 231^c	125.5 ± 18	53.9 ± 6
08/26/95					
704 Interamnia	43.9 ± 4	7769 ± 625	3889 ± 250	239.5 ± 24	113.1 ± 10
56 Melete	21.1 ± 2	5970 ± 492	2711 ± 190^c		
08/29/1995					
704 Interamnia	43.1 ± 4	1067 ± 151	452.7 ± 25.7^c	30.4 ± 3	13.0 ± 1
386 Siegena	19.5 ± 2	656 ± 45	283.4 ± 12^c		

^aDerived responsivity for $\Sigma 1 - 10$ detectors. Corrected for filter response of the asteroids. See section 4.1 for details.

^bDerived responsivity for detector 5 alone. Corrected for filter response of the asteroids. See section 4.1 for details.

^cBecause of the mispointing mentioned in sections 3, and 4.1, this value is derived from the two detectors (usually numbers 4 and 5) with the highest number of counts. We fit a point source sized gaussian to these two detectors and used the peak flux of the gaussian to estimate the number of counts 5 would have had if we had pointed correctly.

TABLE 4
100 μ m FLUXES AND COMPACTNESS

Galaxy	100 μ m Flux from Det. 5 (Jy)	100 μ m Flux from Sum (Jy)	100 μ m Flux from IRAS ^a (Jy)
MCG+02-04-025	7.4 ± 1.0	8.0 ± 1.5	9.6 ± 0.2
III Zw 35	15.0 ± 1.3	13.2 ± 2.1	13.7 ± 0.2
UGC 02369	10.9 ± 1.1	9.1 ± 1.6	11.1 ± 0.2
NGC 1275	6.0 ± 0.7	7.5 ± 1.5	6.9 ± 0.4
VII Zw 31	9.1 ± 1.7	7.9 ± 2.9	10.4 ± 0.1
UGC 05101	18.4 ± 2.0	19.2 ± 3.4	21.2 ± 0.2
NGC 3110	15.1 ± 1.5	15.8 ± 1.9	23.2 ± 0.1
NGC 4151	3.7 ± 0.9	4.1 ± 1.9	8.6 ± 0.4
UGC 08696	17.7 ± 2.1	17.3 ± 2.9	22.4 ± 0.1
NGC 6090	9.3 ± 1.9	8.4 ± 2.4	9.3 ± 0.1
NGC 6286	20.7 ± 3.5	21.7 ± 4.5	22.0 ± 0.1
IRAS 1713+53	7.5 ± 1.6	6.4 ± 2.7	8.4 ± 0.1
IRAS 1720-00	24.8 ± 3.2	19.4 ± 4.0	37.6 ± 0.5
UGC 10923	8.7 ± 1.0	9.2 ± 1.4	$10.2 \pm 1.$
NGC 7469	42.9 ± 5.3	40.5 ± 6.9	34.9 ± 0.6
NGC 7541	36.0 ± 4.5	38.7 ± 6.0	40.6 ± 0.1
Zw 475.056	11.5 ± 1.4	10.1 ± 2.3	11.6 ± 0.1
NGC 7625	19.5 ± 3.2	19.7 ± 3.1	17.2 ± 0.1
NGC 7770	3.5 ± 1.7	6.9 ± 2.0	...
NGC 7771	34.4 ± 3.4	37.6 ± 4.5	37.4 ± 0.9
Markarian 331	24.2 ± 2.2	22.5 ± 2.8	20.9 ± 0.2
UGC 12915	9.7 ± 1.3	11.6 ± 1.9	13.4 ± 0.2

^aIRAS fluxes are uncorrected for color from BGS, BGS2, Edelson et al. 1987 (for NGC 4151), or Mazzarella et al. 1991 (for UGC 10923).

TABLE 5
OBSERVED GALAXY SIZES

Galaxy	FWHM Gaussian ^a (D_g in $''$)	$2 \times r_o$ from fit ^b (D_e in $''$)	$2 \times r_o$ from fluxes ^c ($''$)	Resolved? ^d
MCG+02-04-025	19.0	11.0	12.9	~Y
III Zw 35	8.2	<12	...	N
UGC 02369	<7	<12	8.4	N
NGC 1275	30.0	17.0	10.1	Y
VII Zw 31	<8	<7	10.0	N
UGC 05101	20.6	<12	10.2	~Y
NGC 3110	23.7	13.0	22.6	Y
NGC 4151	19.7	<12	24.7	N
UGC 08696	3.0	<12	12.3	~Y
NGC 6090	12.5	<12	5.4	N
NGC 6286	21.3	12.0	7.9	~Y
IRAS 1713+53	<8	<12	9.5	N
IRAS 1720-00	<7	<12	16.0	~Y
UGC 10923	20.2	11.0	10.6	Y
NGC 7469	14.0	7.0	...	~Y
NGC 7541	23.0	12.5	9.7	Y
Zw 475.056	4.5	<12	5.8	N
NGC 7625	21.8	13.0	...	Y
NGC 7770	...	...	...	~Y
NGC 7771	16.3	<12	...	N
Markarian 331	12.3	<12	...	N
UGC 12915	23.4	14.0	14.0	Y

^aFWHM of emitting region from 1-D fit assuming the spatial distribution of the flux is Gaussian and the convolving beam is a Gaussian of $\sigma = 15.6''$ (FWHM = $26''$).

^bScale size of the galaxy with a model where $I = I_o e^{-r/r_o}$. The 2-D galaxy model is convolved with a 2-D PSF and a 1-D fit is made by the calculated flux in detectors 1-10 with the observed flux.

^cScale size of the galaxy with a model where $I = I_o e^{-r/r_o}$. Calculated from the detector 5 and IRAS fluxes (table 3) assuming a “beam” of $36''$ for detector 5 and $4'$ for the IRAS flux.

^dDo we resolve the FIR emission from the galaxy? Y means we do, ~Y means we have some evidence for extension, N means we see none. Note that objects for which the core is unresolved by comparison with the point source profile can still show evidence for extended emission.

NOTE.—Galaxies with $D_g < 20''$ and a $D_e < 6''$ have unresolved cores (except for the high S/N NGC 7469) and we do not claim the fits given in columns 2 and 3 represent the actual size of the emitting region for the unresolved galaxies. Galaxies with a Y or ~Y have values that truly represent the emitting region sizes to $+15\%$ and -20% . See section 4.2 for details.

TABLE 6
TEMPERATURES AND OPTICAL DEPTHS DERIVED USING EXPONENTIAL SIZES

Galaxy	60 μm^{a} (Jy)	100 μm^{a} (Jy)	D_e ($''$)	T_d^{b} (K)	τ_{100}^{b}	A_V^{c}
MCG+02-04-025	8.9	8.0	11.0	45	2.1×10^{-3}	1.6
III Zw 35	11.9	13.8	<12.0	~ 40	$> 4.8 \times 10^{-3}$	> 3.6
UGC 02369	7.9	11.1	<12.0	~ 37	$> 5.3 \times 10^{-3}$	> 3.9
NGC 1275	7.4	6.9	17.0	44	8.4×10^{-4}	0.6
VII Zw 31	5.9	10.4	< 7.0	~ 34	$> 2.0 \times 10^{-2}$	> 15.0
UGC 05101	13.0	21.3	<12.0	~ 35	$> 1.3 \times 10^{-2}$	> 9.5
NGC 3110	8.0	15.8	13.0	32	1.1×10^{-2}	8.3
NGC 4151	3.2	4.1	<12.0	~ 38	$> 1.7 \times 10^{-3}$	> 1.3
UGC 08696	22.1	22.4	<12.0	~ 42	$> 6.3 \times 10^{-3}$	> 4.7
NGC 6090	6.3	9.3	<12.0	~ 36	$> 4.8 \times 10^{-3}$	> 3.6
NGC 6286	8.4	21.7	12.0	30	2.6×10^{-2}	20.0
IRAS 1713+53	6.4	8.4	<12.0	~ 37	$> 3.6 \times 10^{-3}$	> 2.7
IRAS 1720-00	17.9	19.4	<12.0	~ 42	$> 6.0 \times 10^{-3}$	> 4.2
UGC 10923	4.7	10.2	11.0	31	1.1×10^{-2}	8.3
NGC 7469	27.7	34.9	7.0	39	4.0×10^{-2}	30.0
NGC 7541	20.6	40.6	12.5	33	3.0×10^{-2}	23.0
Zw 475.056	8.8	11.6	<12.0	~ 37	$> 5.0 \times 10^{-3}$	> 3.8
NGC 7625	8.6	17.2	13.0	32	1.2×10^{-2}	9.0
NGC 7770	2.6	4.8	<12.0	~ 33	...	...
NGC 7771	17.8	32.6	<12.0	~ 33	$> 2.3 \times 10^{-2}$	> 17.0
Markarian 331	17.3	20.9	<12.0	~ 39	$> 7.7 \times 10^{-3}$	> 5.8
UGC 12915	5.4	11.6	14.0	31	7.7×10^{-3}	5.8

^aFluxes quoted are from IRAS unless the 100 μm IRAS flux is beyond our errors or a companion galaxy complicates the system. See section 5.2 to determine the source of the flux we used in any particular galaxy. Usually if we did not use the IRAS point we used our 100 μm point and a 60 μm point scaled so that the ratio of 60 and 100 μm fluxes is the same as for IRAS.

^bThese parameters derived from simple single slab model with an emitting region area = $\pi(1/2 D_e)^2$ and $n = 1.5$ where dust emissivity, $Q \propto \lambda^{-n}$.

^cUsing $A_V/\tau_{100} = 750$ (Makinen et al. 1985).

TABLE 7
TEMPERATURES AND OPTICAL DEPTHS DERIVED USING GAUSSIAN SIZES

Galaxy	60 μm^{a} (Jy)	100 μm^{a} (Jy)	D_g ($''$)	T_d^{b} (K)	τ_{100}^{b}	A_V^{c}
MCG+02-04-025	8.9	8.0	19.0	45	7.2×10^{-4}	0.5
NGC 1275	7.4	6.9	30.0	44	2.7×10^{-4}	0.2
NGC 3110	8.0	15.8	23.7	32	3.3×10^{-3}	2.5
NGC 6286	8.4	21.7	21.3	30	8.4×10^{-3}	6.3
UGC 10923	4.7	10.2	20.2	31	3.4×10^{-3}	2.6
NGC 7469	27.7	34.9	14.0	38	1.0×10^{-2}	7.5
NGC 7541	20.6	40.6	23.0	32	8.8×10^{-3}	6.6
NGC 7625	8.6	17.2	21.8	32	4.3×10^{-3}	3.2
UGC 12915	5.4	11.6	23.4	31	2.8×10^{-3}	2.1

^aFluxes quoted are from IRAS unless the 100 μm IRAS flux is beyond our errors. See section 5.2 to determine the source of the flux we used in any particular galaxy. Usually if we did not use the IRAS point we used our 100 μm point and a 60 μm point scaled so that the ratio of 60 and 100 μm fluxes is the same as for IRAS.

^bThese parameters are derived from a simple single slab model with an emitting region area = $\pi(1/2FWHM)^2$ and $n = 1.5$ where dust emissivity, $Q \propto \lambda^{-n}$.

^cUsing $A_V/\tau_{100} = 750$ (Makinen et al. 1985).

TABLE 8
TEMPERATURES, OPTICAL DEPTHS, AND EMISSIVITY EXPONENTS DERIVED
FROM 60 μm , 100 μm , AND LONGER WAVELENGTHS.

λ (μm)	Flux (Jy)	Ref.	D_e ($''$)	T_d^{a} (K)	τ_{100}^{a}	A_V^{b}	n ^a
UGC 05101							
60	13.0	2	< 12.0	~ 35	$> 1.3 \times 10^{-2}$	> 8.5	~ 1.50
100	21.3	2					
350	<2.644	7					
450	1.433	7					
800	0.143	7					
1100	0.068	7					
1250	<0.036	3					
NGC 3110							
60	8.0 ^c	1,2	13.0	32	$> 1.1 \times 10^{-2}$	8.3	1.55
100	15.8	1					
1250	0.033 ^c	1,3					
UGC 08696							
60	22.1	2	< 12.0	~ 42	$> 6.4 \times 10^{-3}$	> 4.8	~ 1.51
100	22.4	2					
350	1.004	7					
450	0.707	7					
800	0.084	7					
1100	0.051	7					
1250	<0.063	7					
1300	0.020	5					
NGC 6090							
60	6.3	2	< 12.0	~ 31	$> 8.9 \times 10^{-3}$	> 6.7	~ 2.28
100	9.3	2					
1300	0.003	4					
NGC 6286							
60	8.4	8	12.0	29	3.2×10^{-2}	24.0	1.77
100	21.7	1					
1250	0.040	3					
UGC 10923							
60	4.7	6	11.0	~ 28	$> 1.9 \times 10^{-2}$	> 14.5	> 2.20
100	10.2	6					
1300	<0.006	4					

TABLE 8—*Continued*

λ (μm)	Flux (Jy)	Ref.	D_e ($''$)	T_d^{a} (K)	τ_{100}^{a}	A_V^{b}	n^{a}
NGC 7469							
60	27.7	2	7.0	~ 37	$> 4.6 \times 10^{-2}$	> 35.0	> 1.69
100	34.9	2					
1250	< 0.033	3					
NGC 7541							
60	20.6	2	12.5	32	3.4×10^{-2}	26.0	1.67
100	40.6	2					
1250	0.067	3					
NGC 7771							
60	17.8 ^d	1,2	< 12.0	~ 33	$> 2.3 \times 10^{-2}$	> 17.0	~ 1.49
100	32.6 ^d	1,2					
1250	0.070	3					
Markarian 331							
60	17.3	2	< 12.0	~ 35	$> 1.5 \times 10^{-2}$	> 8.6	> 2.01
100	20.9	2					
1300	< 0.009	4					

^aThese parameters are derived from a simple single slab model with an emitting region area = $\pi(1/2FWHM)^2$ and $Q \propto \lambda^{-n}$.

^bUsing $A_V/\tau_{100} = 750$ (Makinen et al. 1985).

^cWe use our “small beam” 100 μm flux for NGC 3110 so the 60 and 1250 μm points quoted here are scaled so that the ratio of each to the 100 μm flux remains the same as in was for the large beam (IRAS) flux.

^dThe IRAS flux is a combination of NGC 7770 and 7771. The value we quote here is an estimate for NGC 7771 only using the BGS flux as a starting point. See section 5.2.19 for details.

REFERENCES.— (1) This Paper; (2) BGS; (3) Carico et al. 1992; (4) Chini et al. 1992; (5) Krügel et al. 1988; (6) Mazzarella et al. 1991; (7) Rigopoulou et al. 1996a; (8) Surace et al. 1993.